THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH: VALENTINUS AND HIS GOSPEL POEM

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

BY

THEODORE NICHOLAS THALASSINOS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

SEPTEMBER, 1967

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the World Council of Churches, the Episcopal Church, and Seabury Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois for having given me the opportunity to come to the U.S.A. and study.

Gratitude is also expressed to the University of Chicago, the Division of the Humanities, and its deans, Richard T. Bruère and George V. Bobrinskoy for their manifold assistance they have given me.

In particular I am indebted to the Department of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and to the Oriental Institute for the invaluable assistance and encouragement they gave me during the years of my studies, and especially to Professors Allen Paul Wikgren, Chairman of the Department of New Testament and Early Christian Literature, and Robert McQueen Grant, Professor of New Testament, whose enthusiasm and inspiration stimulated and guided the writing of this study. Appreciation is also expressed to Professors Amos Niven Wilder, Ernest Cadman Colwell, Paul Schubert, Raymond A. Bowman, and J. Coert Rylaarsdam under whom I had at various times the privilege to work. Harold Rideout Willoughby, Ralph Marcus, William A. Irwin, and Joachim Wach have already left behind this world of search and toil. Let these lines be a tribute of gratitude to the beloved masters.

My thankfulness must also be expressed to the scholars who have toiled in the same field and whose publications have helped and guided me.

Gratitude is due to my parents who, in my early years, did not spare any sacrifice for my education, and to my beloved wife Yiota, whose stimulation has always pushed me to the path of progress.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

I. THE SOURCES OF VALENTINIANISM 5

Historical and philological Approach
The Earliest Sources
Results of Historical and Philological Criticism
Later Sources
The Nag Hammâdi Findings
The Composite Nature of the Gospel of Truth

II. THE DOCTRINE OF VALENTINUS AND THE AUTHOR OF THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH: LITERARY SOURCES 15

The Problem
Quispel's Reconstruction
Sagnard's Reconstruction
The Fragments of Valentinus and Their Method of Interpretation

III. THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND ITS SYNCRETISTIC ENVIRONMENT. 33

Sitz im Leben
The Form Critical Method Evaluated
The Hindu Influence Hypothesis

IV. THE LITERARY CHARACTER OF THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH: THE GOSPEL POEM 46

The Language of the Gospel of Truth
Retranslation into Greek
Poetry in the Gospel of Truth
Valentinus' Poetry Reconstructed
The Poem as a Gospel
The Gospel of Truth as a Cryptic Document

V. THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND LITURGY 135

The Gospel of Truth as a Baptismal Homily
The "Confirmation Homily" Hypothesis

The "Psychic" Baptism of the Church and the Valentinian "Pneumatic" Baptism
Baptism and Confirmation as One Rite

VI. THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND VALENTINIANISM 150

The Gospel of Truth and Gnosticism
The Gospel of Truth as a General Gnostic Work Only
The Gospel of Truth as a Valentinian Work

VII. THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND THE ODES OF SOLOMON 180

The Similarities between the Two Documents
The Place of the Odes of Solomon in Early Christian Literature
The Odes of Solomon on the Borderline between "Orthodoxy" and Valentinianism

VIII. THE DOCTRINE OF VALENTINUS AND THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH: HISTORY, PSYCHOLOGY, THEOLOGY, AND COSMOLOGY . . . 200

Fragment I, the Psychology of Valentinus and the Cosmology of the Valentinian Sources: Ignorance and Fear
The Gospel of Truth and Its Relationship to Ignorance and Fear: The Cosmology of the Tractate and the Nightmare
The Nightmare, the Age of the Dreamer and the Author of the Gospel of Truth
The Nightmare and Contemporary Literary Sources
The Nightmare and Contemporary Literary Sources: Artemidorus of Daldis

IX. PSYCHOLOGY AND COSMOLOGY IN VALENTINUS: THE MYTH OF SOPHIA 229

The Psychology of Valentinus and the Adventures of Sophia: The Identity of Valentinus' Personality through the Various Phases of His Personal Tragedy
The Fall of Sophia and the Sin of Valentinus
The Restoration of Sophia and the Repentance of Valentinus
The Pride of the Valentinians as a Corollary of the Valentinian Doctrine
The Ecclesiastical Ambitions of Valentinus and the Church of Rome: The Date of the Gospel of Truth
The Anticlimax: Retreat in Despair
The Author of the Gospel of Truth and Pride
Valentinus as the Author of the Gospel of Truth

CONCLUSION 259

APPENDIX: THE SPECIFIC VALENTINIAN USE OF THE MYTH OF SOPHIA; ITS USE IN THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH BY VALENTINUS . . 278

BIBLIOGRAPHY 287

INTRODUCTION

The Gospel of Truth and the literary problems that it presents have been the object of intense discussion in recent years. The first problem, of course, was the problem of its translation from the Coptic, but translation necessarily is already interpretation and therefore discrepancies between the existing translations from the Coptic were to be expected.

It is very unfortunate that we no longer have the original Greek in which The Gospel of Truth was written. Ménard has retranslated the Coptic into Greek. This reveals some aspects of the original text that neither the Coptic nor the translations into modern languages can manifest. In these modern translations, at best we have translations of a translation, and it is amusing sometimes to see the differences between the German, English, and French renderings of the same passage. The Greek retroversion, on the other hand, is another modern translation and its character remains hypothetical. We must assume, however, that the Greek retroversion is suggestive in many respects, since it exhibits the technical vocabulary of the author of the document, and also certain stylistic characteristics which become evident immediately.

Another serious problem is the character of the "Gospel." Several suggestions have been made towards that direction. Thus, the document has been considered as a "Gospel," and a meditation on the

Gospel, as a homily Baptismal or Confirmational, even as a confused document both in style and ideas.

The Jung Codex, of which the "Gospel" is a part, differs from all other codices that were found together in Nag Hammâdi in a jar in an ancient cemetery. The difference marks the works, included in that Codex, as the work of a different school of Gnosticism. Most of the other documents belong to the so-called Sethian Gnosis or to the Corpus Hermeticum. But of what school? A sharp discrepancy arises at this point among scholars. From the very beginning the "Gospel" was considered as a product of the Valentinian school and perhaps of Valentinus himself, the founder of the school. Others, as Schenke, rejected this view insisting on the general Gnostic character of the work.

Others like Säve-Söderbergh and Segelberg have related the work, as said above, to the liturgy of the Church, but no one, to my knowledge, ever denied the literary unity of the "Gospel," something that is very customary for scholars to do with almost every ancient document. This silence on that particular problem is very surprising. Very few, on the other hand, like Ringgren, Ménard, and Grobel have gone beyond the recognition of a few and very limited poetical sections within the text. This, however, would be expected to be a necessary feature of the document if it is somehow related to the liturgy of the Church. This writer believes that in the "Gospel" we have more than a mere meditation on Baptism or on Confirmation. The "Gospel" is very complex in its nature and cannot be easily labeled as a mere meditation of any sort.

On the other hand, the authorship of the document, even by those who have accepted it as a work of Valentinus, has not been the subject of thorough examination. The attribution of the "Gospel" to Valentinus has never been more than an occasional guess or remark, especially on the basis of the information given by Irenaeus, but it never became the object of a special investigation based on the existing Valentinian data, and on the nature and character of the Gospel of Truth. It is the intention of this writer to re-examine the question of authorship of the Evangelium Veritatis, which has so much to tell us about its author, especially if projected against the background of other early Valentinian documents that scholars have studied during the last fifty years or so.

Finally, it is customary to refer either Valentinus, or the author of the "Gospel," to the syncretistic religious background of the period in which it was written. Thus it has been interpreted either in terms of Platonism, or of Oriental religious philosophy and religion. The safest theory is to connect the "Gospel" to Judaism, since it serves as an interpretation to certain fundamental religious features of late Judaism. But what lies behind that type of Judaism? The customary answer is that Iranian dualism is one of the features of both Judaism and the "Gospel." As a matter of fact, there is much dualism in the document. The Platonic contrast, between the ideal and the actual world, is not sufficient to explain its dualism. The gap in this case between the two extremes is much wider than the usual Greek antithesis between idea and reality. The world is definitely wrong according to this.

On the other hand, Iranian dualism is not a solution for our problem, even though it betrays its presence in the World Theory of the document. However, when we turn to the Far East, we may easily recognize the home of the author of the Gospel, and his religious philosophy. The main points of contact are the author's conception of the world as thoroughly illusionary in nature, his reduction to dream and intoxication of every experience of the present life, and some terms he is fond of using which establish a relationship between the Gospel and the Bagavaggita or the Upanishads. We cannot exclude, however, the influence of Iranian dualism on the way the Gospel utilizes Hindu material, since this world is more than a dream, it is positively evil, or in order to use the language of mathematics it is below zero, namely, below the level of nonexistence. This position brings it close to the negative numbers: the world is a deficiency.

There is something, however, that does not fit any known system of Monism or Dualism. This is the nature of the Psychic element which is not absent from our tractate. Matter ultimately will be destroyed by eschatological fire as in the theory of the world in Christianity and Stoicism. Spirit will be reabsorbed by its source of origin. The Psychic element, however, will remain forever, being neither material nor spiritual, but as a waste of the divine nature which remains forever at the gate of God's Paradise. This is something specifically Valentinian and its explanation remains unfolded.

CHAPTER I

THE SOURCES OF VALENTINIANISM

Historical and Philological Approach

One of the main methods of historical reconstruction is the use of well-attested literary sources. These sources belong to a definite time; they reflect certain characteristic ideas; they presuppose particular developments in certain localities. Above all, they correspond to individual writing which express the ideas and feelings of their authors.

The sources of Valentinianism are literary documents written by the Valentinians themselves and preserved, usually in a fragmentary condition by their religious opponents who in their antivalentinian criticism were forced to incorporate into their writings extracts from the sources they were attacking and formulate ideas they meant to refute. The big question mark, however, was on the side of the intention of the Church fathers which was definitely polemic. Thus they selected the parts of the heretical writings they preferred and they formulated the gnostic ideas as they understood them. More attention is given now to their objectivity but the extracts they have preserved are scanty.

The Gospel of Truth from the first day of its publication in 1956 appeared with claims to Valentinian authorship; it must, however, be subjected to literary and historical criticism in order to reveal

its credentials before it can assume its place among the Valentinian sources. This process of investigation automatically establishes a connection between the document under examination and these sources and, consequently, a review of these sources is necessary to the effort to allocate the new document in the literary line of its related writings and place it under its correct historical perspective.

These general principles have their particular application to the Gospel of Truth. There is an almost common agreement that this document is a second century A.D. Christian Gnostic work. As such it must be compared to its contemporary Christian Gnostic literature, both for its form and content.

There is a further suggestion that tractate is a production of the Valentinian school, and perhaps the work of Valentinus himself. This creates the obligation to study it against the background of existing Valentinian literature and of what we know about the person and career of Valentinus. The sources of Valentinianism thus constitute the immediate approximation of our document and, as such, they must be given attention prior to any study of the newly discovered Gospel.

The Earlist Sources

The teaching of Valentinus, the founder of the Gnostic Valentinian school, and of his followers has been indirectly known for centuries through the writings of the Church fathers and ecclesiastical writers. The writings of the Valentinians themselves were lost for centuries and the ecclesiastical sources were almost the only means available to the student of Valentinian Gnosticism.

Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia, or ancient Salamis, in Cyprus in the fourth century A.D., has preserved in his Panarion the Letter of Ptolemy to Flora[1] and also, in the same book, an elaborate presentation of the Valentinian tenets.[2]

Origen, who died around A.D. 254, in his Commentary to the Gospel of John included fifty fragments of Heracleon, the disciple of Valentinus, on the Johannine Prologue.[3]

Origen's contemporary, Hippolytus of Rome, wrote in the third century A.D. his Refutation against All Heresies, earlier known as Philosophoumena, where he includes important material on the Valentinian Gnosis, especially on Valentinus, Ptolemy, and Mark the Magician.

Tertullian, at the beginning of the same century, wrote a treatise under the title Adversus Valentinianos.

Clement, the Alexandrian presbyter and theologian, after the Eighth book of his Stromata, preserved the Excerpta of Theodotus and other texts or ideas of the Valentinian school, especially of its Oriental branch and also, in the same work, some sporadic information on the teaching of Valentinus himself. Clement was born about the year A.D. 150, namely during the apogee of the activity of Valentinus who died on the island of Cyprus not far from the Egyptian shores. Theodotus lived in the West and his name is related to the Occidental

---

[1]Epiphanius, Panarion, 33, 3 sqq. For a complete list of the editions of the Letter to Flora see Gilles Quispel, "Ptolemée Lettre â Flora," Sources Chetiennes (Paris: ed. du Cerf, 1944).

[2]Karl Holl, "Epiphanius, Anchoratus und Panarion," Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Erslen Drei Jahrhunderts, XXV (1915), 30-31.

[3]A. E. Brooke, "Fragments of Heracleon," Texts and Studies, Vol. I (1911).

or Italian branch of the Valentinian school. Clement thus is related not only to Origen his pupil, but also to immediate Valentinian sources.

Earlier in the second century A.D,, Irenaeus, an Asia Minor Christian who became bishop of Lyons in Southern France, fought personally the Valentinians in the Valley of Rhones and refuted their doctrines that he reproduces in his work Adversus Haereses written around A.D. 180, but expressing the earlier experiences of the author.

These sources and the fragments of Valentinus, preserved mainly by Clement of Alexandria, constitute the earliest and more important means for the study of Valentinianism.

Results of Historical and Philological Criticism

Quispel reviews the significant contributions in the field of Valentinianism of men like A. Hilgenfeld, C. Heinrici, W. Foerster, O. Dibelius, C. Barth, and R. P. Casey,[1] and utilizes their studies in order to summarize their positive achievements into eight statements:

1. Irenaeus' sketch of Valentinus' teaching in Adv. Haer. i. 11. 1 is dependable.[2]

2. The Oriental school is closer to the teaching of Valentinus than the other branches of Valentinianism.[3]

3. In Adv. Haer. i. 1. 1, 2, 3 on the origin of the aeons and of evil, Irenaeus is close to the authentic theory of Valentinus.

---

[1]Gilles Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentine," Vigiliae Christianae, I (1947), 44.

[2]Adolf Hilgenfeld, Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums (Leipzig: R. Reisland, 1884), p. 52.

[3]Carl Heinrici, Die Valentinian Gnosis und die Heilige Schrift (Berlin, 1871).

4. Irenaeus o. 2. 3 runs parallel to Hippolytus vi. 24.[1]

5. With the words "ὁ δὲ Πατήρ" Irenaeus in Adv. Haer. i. 2. 4 starts a new source as Heinrici had already suspected, but whose hint was neglected by later scholars.

6. Irenaeus i. 4. 1 - i. 6. 3 and the Excerpta of Theodotus 43-65 use a common source that describes events outside the Pleroma.[2] This source was written by Ptolemaeus.[3]

7. Hippolytus vi. 29 seq. presents the teachings of the Western school of Valentinianism in a later stage of development.[4]

8. There is almost a general agreement among scholars as to the distribution of the Excerpta of Theodotus between Ptolemy, Theodotus, and Clement of Alexandria.[5]

In this connection, François M.-M. Sagnard should be mentioned as one who makes a thorough re-examination of the Valentinian sources on the basis of the work of his predecessors and of his own research.[6] He studies Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 12. 1, what he calls "La Grande Notice" in itself. He further defines the relationship of this text to Irenaeus i. 11 and 12. In the third place he examines the relationship between Hippolytus Refutatio vi, what he calls theme B, to distinguish it from theme A, or "La Grande Notice" of Irenaeus 1. 12. 1, and then proceeds to the formulation of his conclusion.

---

[1] W. Foerster, "Von Valentin zu Heracleon," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, VII (1928), 57-67.

[2] O. Dibelius, "Studien zur Geschichte der Valentinianen," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, IX, 230 seq.

[3] Carola Barth, "Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis," Texte und Untersuchungen, XXXVII, No. 3 (1911), 11 seq.

[4] Foerster, p. 100.

[5] Robert Pierce Casey, The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria (London, 1934), p. 5 seqq.

[6] François M.-M. Sagnard, "La Gnose Valentinienne et le Témoignage de Saint Irénnée," Études de Philosophie Médiévale, Vol. XXXVI (1947); see, also, by the same author, "Clemens, Titus, Flavius, Alexandrinus: Les Extraits de Théodote," Sources Chrétiennes, xxiii (1948), 220-32.

Sagnard believes that Irenaeus' "Grande Notice," or theme A, represents the teaching of Ptolemy in spite of the fact that its structure is composite. Hippolytus' "Grande Notice," or theme B, is an artificial composition centered around great names of Gnosticism and Greek Philosophy but preserves certain elements of fresh information which should be accepted with caution. Sagnard uses theme B as a double check for theme A. Hippolytus' attribution of his "Grande Notice" to Valentinus is utterly false.[1]

Later Sources

These sources of Valentinianism which are the earliest do not exhaust the list of available source material on the subject. There are some later sources which include Valentinian material which may be consulted with due consideration of their late date. These are:

Pseudo-Tertullian's Adversus omnes Haereses, Philastrius' De Haeresibus, and the Valentinian material of Epiphanius other than the Letter to Flora mentioned above.

Three Valentinian writings which, according to Sagnard's hypothesis, belong to a first Syntagma of Hippolytus and contain thirty-two heresies from Dositheus to Noetos.

Theodoretus, bishop of Cyprus, in the fifth century A.D.

The Gnostic writing of Pistis Sophia and the book Ieou of the end of the second and the beginning of the third century A.D.

Certain strata in the Corpus Hermeticum starting from the third century and containing Valentinian parallels.

Some Astrological and Alchemical treatises.

Plotinus' works The Enneads and Against the Gnostics in the fourth century A.D.

And, finally, sporadic remarks of later ecclesiastical writers.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 220-32.

Contemporary to the Valentinian movement are Philo Alexandrinus, Plutarch, Lucian, Albinus, Apuleius, Numenius, the author of the Odes of Solomon, and other writers who give us information on the religions and the religious philosophies of the period. Above all we must consider the New Testament, Canonical and Apocryphal, and the development of the Christian Church during the first two centuries, which to a great extent conditioned the development of the Valentinian Church and of its doctrine.

Relevant to the subject are also the developments of Jewish mysticism of the subsequent centuries based on earlier Gnostic and Valentinian ideas, Manichaism, the successor to Gnosticism, and Mazdaism.

The Nag Hammâdi Findings

All these sources have been used by scholars for the understanding of Valentinianism, which in the second century A.D. became the most dangerous explosive against Catholic Orthodoxy.

It was the privilege and also the cross of students of Gnosticism in the last decade to be, for the first time, in touch with actual Valentinian and other Gnostic writings that the sands of Nag Hammâdi in Egypt had kept hidden in their silent depths for centuries.

In 1945, forty-eight Gnostic documents were found in a jar in an ancient cemetery near a place in Middle Egypt, known to pre-Islamic times as Chenoboskion (Grazing place of ducks), not far from the present-day Nag Hammâdi. The writings include Gnostic and Hermetic treatises.

Four of these treatises have been identified as Valentinian.

They constitute the Jung Codex, named after the Swiss Psychological Institute which finally bought it. They are Coptic translations of their lost Greek originals in the subakhmimic dialect. The tractates are: an Apocryphal letter of James known as the Apocryphon of Iacobus; the Gospel of Truth or Evangelium Veritatis, so named after the two introductory words of the document; the Epistle to Rheginus on the Resurrection; and a treatise on The Three Natures, to which is appended a short Prayer of the Apostles.[1]

H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, and later M. Malinine undertook the responsibility to publish the writings of the Jung Codex. In 1956 they published its second tractate under the title Evangelium Veritatis.[2] In 1963, the same men and W. Till published the third tractate under the title De Resurrectione, Epistula ad Rheginum.[3]

The editors of the Jung Codex believe that the Jung Codex includes Valentinian documents. H. M. Schenke, on the contrary, sharply rejects the Valentinian character of the "so genannten Evangelium Veritatis."[4] This was his reaction to Van Unnik who went so far as to assert that the second document of the Jung Codex is none other than the Gospel of Truth written, according to him, by Valentinus himself,[5]

---

[1]On the documents and their history, see F. L. Cross (ed.), The Jung Codex (London, 1955).

[2]H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, and M. Malinine (eds.), Evangelium Veritatis (Zürich: Rascher Verlag, 1956).

[3]M. Malinine et al. (eds.), De Resurrectione: Epistula ad Rheginum (Zürich und Stuttgart: Rascher Verlag, 1963).

[4]H. M. Schenke, Die Herkunf des Sogennanten Evangelium Veritatis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959).

[5]W. C. Van Unnik, 'The Gospel of Truth and the New Testament," The Jung Codex, ed. F. L. Cross (London, 1955), pp. 81-129.

and mentioned by Irenaeus.[1] Hans Jonas, in an additional chapter to his work, Gnosis und Spätantike Geist, published in 1964, does not exclude the Valentinian authorship of the tractate, and this on the basis of external and internal evidence.[2] R. M. Grant accepts the Gospel as the work of Valentinus and finds resemblances between the speculations and those of the Shepherd of Hermas.[3]

The Composite Nature of the Gospel of Truth

It is the conviction of the present writer that Van Unnik's hypothesis deserves full attention for reasons that will be discussed here. If, however, the Gospel is a composite document, as the present writer believes, then it raises a double problem, i.e., the problem of its two texts. If one of the texts is poetical in form, then it raises the problem of the reconstruction of that poetry, in terms of what we know of Valentinus' poetical activity. Along the traditional line this can be reduced to seven verses preserved by Hippolytus in the poem which is known from its introductory two verses, i.e., The Harvest or Valentinian Fragment VIII.[4]

By the same token the isolation of a poetical text within the

---

[1] W. W. Harvey, Irenaeus Adversus Haereses III (Cantabrigiae: Typis Academicis, 1857), II, 9.

[2] Hans Jonas, "Gnosis und Spätantike Geist," Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des A.T. und N.T. (2d ed.; Göttingen, 1964).

[3] R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity (New York: Columbia Press, 1959), p. 128.

[4] P. Wendland (ed.), "Hippolytus Werke Refutatio Omnium Haeresium (Elenchos)," Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, XXVI (Leipzig, 1916), 6-8.

<u>Gospel of Truth</u> and its recasting into a poetical form means that we have access to the lost poetry of Valentinus who is one of the four poets of second-century Christianity.

CHAPTER II

THE DOCTRINE OF VALENTINUS AND THE AUTHOR OF THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH: LITERARY SOURCES

The existence of the literary sources mentioned in Chapter I and their enrichment by the findings of Nag Hammâdi pose the problem of their correlation and interpretation. A task of primary importance in it would be the reconstruction of the doctrine of Valentinus on the basis of the old and new material and the establishment of its relationship to the Gospel of Truth.

The Problem

The doctrine of Valentinus would be a Lydian stone to check the proposed authorship of the second document of the Jung Codex. If the doctrine of the Gospel of Truth is identical to the doctrine of Valentinus, then we have evidence that this document stands close to Valentinus and probably is his own work.

The doctrine of Valentinus, however, is one of the most difficult aspects of the Valentinian problem. Van Unnik believes that the Evangelium Veritatis is an authentic presentation of the teaching and of the religious experience of the founder of the Valentinian school. This thesis, however, must be proved on the basis of other considerations, and the first problem is to identify the doctrine of Valentinus on the basis of other evidence.

Attempts have been made to identify the doctrine of Valentinus on the basis of either the remaining Valentinian fragments preserved by Clement of Alexandria and Hippolytus or the other patristic sources that give us information on him. Sagnard dealt with the first attempt, Quispel with the second. Both attempts deserve to be mentioned here, especially from the point of view of the history of research.

The interest of the writer, however, is not confined to that history as such. His objective is to secure a sound historical basis for the reconstruction of that doctrine in order to use it as a foundation for the identification of the author of the Gospel of Truth.

An ideal basis for the reconstruction of Valentinus' doctrine would be the writings of Valentinus himself. What we have from him is the group of a few fragments. Sagnard read them against the background of the general Valentinian Doctrine. The method appears to be circular but its proving power lies rather in the fact that once a theory has been reached through the inductive method going from the particular to the general even though in a somehow circular way, the theory thus reached can be checked through deduction. In other words, the general principle or theory can be applied in turn to the variety of scattered material as a principle of interpretation. If it fits it we have a verification of the theory which thus explains the facts.

After the publication of the Gospel of Truth we are more fortunate than Sagnard. The general theory that Sagnard reconstructed on the basis of the varied Valentinian material can also be applied to the Gospel of Truth. Thus we have the additional choice of comparing the fragments of Valentinus not only to Valentinian sources but

to a work, which by hypothesis is Valentinus' work. One of these sources, i.e., the fragments, is beyond doubt the work of Valentinus, the other hypothetical; if they agree among themselves we are justified in our theory that Valentinus is the author of both.

Quispel's Reconstruction

In the same year that Sagnard published his monumental study on the Valentinian Gnosis (1947), G. Quispel quite independently attempted a reconstruction of "the original doctrine of Valentinus" on the basis of philological sources that he believes he has found in Patristic Literature.[1]

Quispel's position follows the following line: His starting point is that we do have the doctrine of Valentinus in an original outline. He further believes that this outline may become clear if only we will eliminate from it the additions and doctrinal elaborations of the disciples of Valentinus and especially of Ptolemy. This elimination, he suggests, can be done only by the use of "the methods of modern criticism" based philology.[2] The use of philology is also the fundamental method of F. Sagnard.

The first task of Quispel is, of course, to identify the additions made by the members of the Valentinian school. Upon the identification and the elimination of the later accretions, he believes the reconstruction of the doctrine of Valentinus becomes possible for the simple reason that we are in a position to identify the literary

---

[1]Gilles Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentinus," Vigiliae Christianae, I (1947), 48-73.

[2]Ibid., p. 44.

sources that include it. On the basis of the foregoing data Quispel attempts to trace the historical development of the Valentinian school.

For the teaching of Valentinus, he combines Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 11. 1 with Clement Alex. Strom ii. 36. 2-4; Exc. 33, 4, Tertullian De Carne 15 and Pseuo-Tertullian, Adv. omnes haereses 4.

For the teaching of Ptolemaeus, he combines Irenaeus i. 8. 5; Tertullian, Adv. Valent. 11; Pseudo-Tertullian Adv. omnes haereses 4; the Epistle of Ptolemaeus to Flora, and Irenaeus i. 4. 1 seqq. and i. 6. 1.

For the Italic school he combines Irenaeus i. 2. 4 in conjunction with Hippolytus vi. 29; Irenaeus i. 2. 5 in conjunction with Hippolytus vi. 31; and Irenaeus i. 2. 4 in conjunction with Hippolytus vi. 31. (Quispel refers also to Irenaeus i. 14 which he considers as a copy of a document written by Marcus the Magician, a pupil of Valentinus. This source, he believes, preserved the main outline of Valentinus' teachings, but translated it into a language of Geometric Occultism.)

On the basis of the above combined texts, Quispel draws his final conclusions on the doctrine of Valentinus which he contrasts to the tenets of the other Valentinian schools:

1. Valentinus taught that God is a dyad. This doctrine contradicts Ptolemaeus and the Italic school which rather stressed the unity of the deity.

2. The life of God consists, according to Valentinus, in a gradual emanation of the Son and of the Spirit. The Son is a collective idea and is equated to the aeons. On the emanation of the Son and the Spirit from the Father, Ptolemy and the Italic school agree with Valentinus.

3. Horos or Limit is a continuous function of the Nous. The Italic school stresses the emanation of Horos after the fall of Sophia.

4. Valentinus' doctrine includes just one Sophia. Ptolemy's has two, one within the Pleroma and another outside as an exopleromatic figure.

5. Christ who is born of the exopleromatic Sophia, upon his birth, ascends to the Pleroma. This point is altogether absent from the Italic sources.

6. The demiurge is a hostile figure. Ptolemy rather professes a friendly Creator.

7. The four elements of the material world came out of the passions of the fallen Sophia. Ptolemy taught that the lower soul of man was made out of fear, while the devil was made out of sorrow. Fear and sorrow are two of the passions of Sophia, the other two being despair and ignorance. Fear and sorrow gave birth to the four elements of matter.

8. Christ was a spiritual human being. To this doctrine of the master, Ptolemy contrasts a threefold Christ endowed with a material body, a psychic or animal soul, and a higher spirit. Here we have the classical contrast between the conceptions of the Oriental and the Italic schools of the body of Christ. Valentinus' thesis coincides with the Oriental point of view, and maintains that Christ's spiritual body, the only one he ever had, passed through Mary.

A comparative survey of the above data gives the following picture:

1. Ptolemy and the Italic school disagree with Valentinus on the nature of the Deity. For Valentinus God is a dyad, for them a monad.

2. There is a contrast between Valentinus and the Italic school on the function of Horos, or Limit. For the former, Horos perpetually separates the aeons from the Father; for the latter, Horos emanates only after the fall of Sophia to prevent the products of Sophia from entering the Pleroma. It must be noticed, however, that the Valentinian Horos (Quispel) in Irenaeus i. 11. 1 is duplicated

by another Horos in the "Italic" sense.

The rest of the differences concern Valentinus and Ptolemy. For Valentinus, the Demiurge is hostile; for Ptolemy, he is friendly. For Valentinus, the body of the historical Christ is spiritual; for Ptolemy, it is psychic, namely, animal. Another feature of Valentinus teaching is the ascent of Christ to the Pleroma. This is altogether absent from the other sources. It is also significant that for Valentinus there is only one Sophia.

Quispel believes that behind these divergences there is one single outline conditioned by the Valentinian myth. Ptolemy's deviation from the teaching of the master, he says, may be explained by the reaction of the Church to Marcion's rejection of the Old Testament. Ptolemy tried to counterbalance Valentinian dualism by a conciliatory attitude toward the Old Testament Creator and toward the unity of God. This attitude is evident in the Letter to Flora.

If this modification of the original Valentinian dualism can be explained by his political objectives, the question remains: how can we explain the other differences between him and Valentinus? Why are there two Sophias and a psychic body for Christ?

Quispel answers this question by stressing the contrast that exists between the respective personalities of the two teachers. Valentinus, he says, was a visionary mystic, Ptolemy a teacher with political flexibility.

The visionary character of Valentinus can be proved on the basis of Hippolytus vi. 42. 2, where a vision of Christ is mentioned. This vision stimulated the composition of the "tragic myth" of Valen-

tinus. The same urge led Valentinus to the elaboration of those mythological elements that characterize the Oriental Gnostic sects which are mentioned by Irenaeus in i. 30.

If there is a problem of differences between Valentinus and Ptolemy, there is also a problem of similarities, and this applies to the main outline of doctrine that underlines all the sources that Quispel mentions.

Quispel's explanation is that both Ptolemy and Theodotus, in all probability, depended on an original writing of Valentinus. Theodotus, in the "Ptolemaic" part of his Excerpta, has only partially used this source, while Ptolemy handled it with more freedom. This hypothesis accounts for the unity of the Valentinian doctrine. It also explains the relationship that exists between Theodotus and Ptolemy. An exchange of ideas between the two teachers, i.e., Ptolemy and Theodotus, that would account for their identical outline is out of the question. Ptolemy lived in the West, and Theodotus lived in the East, giving them, therefore, little opportunity to meet each other. The only explanation of the similarities that exist between Ptolemy and Theodotus is the assumption that both have used a common literary source.

On the other hand, Clement would not have included a Ptolemaic document within his collection of the excerpta of Theodotus and the other works belonging to the Oriental school if he knew that the third section of his collection, that is that part of his excerpta which is parallel to the text of Irenaeus, was written by Ptolemy. He probably took that text to be a part of the texts pertaining to the Oriental

school, but why does he not again attribute it to Valentinus, as he does for the fragments that he has preserved under the latter's name? The only possible answer is that Clement did not attribute that part of his collection to Valentinus' pen.

Quispel's work has followed these steps:

1. He summarizes the preliminary work that has been done on the Valentinian sources.

2. He formulates the positive results of the investigation on the sources.

3. He presents the differences between the various branches of the Valentinian school.

4. He stresses the importance of a common document that both Theodotus and Ptolemy have utilized; this document, he believes goes back to Valentinus himself.

Upon this he proceeds to the final stage of his research which is nothing less than the identification of the very text which, according to his view, includes the original doctrine of Valentinus. He calls this identification a reconstruction.

This reconstruction of the doctrine of Valentinus, without any further discussion, consisted of a rearrangement of various texts of Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and the Excerpta of Theodotus.[1] In this he is following the editions of Holl and of Casey to which he adds some personal emendations.

In the form of footnotes, he attaches to the above rearrangement or "Reconstruction" other texts taken from Irenaeus, the Excerpta, Hippolytus, Ptolemy to Flora, and the Valentinian fragments preserved by Clement. He calls these texts a "Commentary."

---

[1] Ibid., p. 47.

It is not my intention to discuss the problem raised by Quispel's hypothetical reconstruction. Besides, the burden of proof lies on his shoulders. I have merely analyzed his methods and conclusions as a part of the history of research and as an aspect to the general discussion of the problem of sources. Two remarks, however, are necessary.

In the first place, as I have noted above, Clement does not attribute the part that is common to Irenaeus and to the Excerpta to Valentinus, and this is against Quispel's theory.

Secondly, Quispel may be right in asserting that on the basis of the sources he utilizes he is entitled to see Valentinus' doctrine as "a systematic conception of the universe which is poetical, but not disorderly, heretical, but not confused." There is no objection to the systematic character of his presentation. It includes theology, christology, cosmoloby, and eschatology. The question is whether this order is Valentinus' achievement of Ptolemy's work. Visionary inspiration usually is followed by systematization. Furthermore, the continuous text of the reconstruction or rearrangement is definitely Quispel's work.

Quispel has given up his view on the original doctrine of Valentinus. R. M. Grant believes that Quispel's reconstruction is still helpful because it shows how the ideas of the Gospel of Truth were further developed in Valentinianism.[1] This view presupposes that the Gospel of Truth represents a kind of Protovalentinianism. Quispel's reconstructed system, the so-called original doctrine of Valentinus,

---

[1]Grant, p. 135.

contains two primary principles, Depth and Silence.[1] This primary couple is the source of the other pairs of aeons.

Grant further reminds us that one of the two accounts of Irenaeus says that Valentinus spoke of a one single perfect aeon in the beginning called Depth and Father or "Perfect Father."[2] He stresses the fact that this account is in agreement with the Gospel of Truth, and, therefore, this must be the original doctrine of Valentinus on the first God.[3]

It seems, however, that it is equally possible that the Evangelium Veritatis includes the notion of the Dyad: the Father-Mother or Father-Spirit couple, the Parental couple which produced the Son.[4] The author of the Gospel of Truth is familiar with the key Valentinian formula which presupposes an advanced mythology, therefore he, too, is familiar with that mythology.[5]

Quispel's article appeared before the publication of the Gospel of Truth. If this document belongs to Valentinus, as I believe it does, the original doctrine of Valentinus is to be sought in this document.

Meanwhile, however, there was the necessity of reconstruction of the whole Valentinian teaching on the basis of the then existing sources before the discovery of the Nag Hammâdi papyrus. Against this background the Gospel of Truth itself had to be projected to reveal

---

[1] II Esdras. 6. 39 relates silence to the beginning of things.

[2] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 1. 1 - 2. 2.

[3] Grant, p. 135.

[4] Evangelium Veritatis 24.-7.

[5] Jonas, p. 411.

its relationship to Valentinianism. Sagnard undertook this enterprise on the basis of the philological work that had been done during the last fifty years or so. He, like Quispel, utilizes this work with some modification and presents his point of view on the Valentinian Gnosis, especially on the basis of the witness of Irenaeus.

Sagnard's Reconstruction

Sagnard, in his reconstruction of the Valentinian doctrines, follows the order of Irenaeus i. 1-8. 4 ("La Grande Notice") which he calls a "texte de base, qui permett d'en saisir l'allure générale, l'articulation des parties, comme aussi de prendre contact avec les termes essentiels d'un vocabulaire technique qu'il faut absolument connaître pour en saisir l'animation."[1] This text, he confesses, is the basis of his study. He calls it theme A or "Grande Notice" and attributes it to Ptolemy.[2]

In addition to this text, he uses Hippolytus vi. 20 seqq., which he calls theme B and believes it was written fifty years later. He uses that text as a "contre épreuve et instrument de descrimination."[3]

Both Sagnard and Quispel have noticed the systematic order of Irenaeus i. 11, but each has a different opinion on its authorship. Quispel, on the basis of its parallelism to the Excerpta of Theodotus 43-65, considers it as a document that has been written by Valentinus himself which Theodotus and Ptolemy have used independently from one another. Sagnard, like Foerster, attributes it to Ptolemy and uses

---

[1] Sagnard, op. cit., p. 141.

[2] Ibid., p. 144. [3] Ibid.

it as a basic criterion by which he tests other Valentinian sources.

The difference between the two opinions is tremendous in itself. It is extremely significant for the interpretation of Valentinianism in general and of the Gospel of Truth in particular.

If the Great Exposition of Irenaeus and Excerpta 43-65 of Theodotus are the original teaching of Valentinus, as Quispel believes, then the Gospel of Truth must be read against this background. The result of this comparison, however, is negative. The Gospel of Truth is remote from this source. If a decision should be made between the two alternatives, Valentinus should stand either on the side of the text that is common to Irenaeus and the Excerpta or on the side of the Gospel of Truth.

If, on the contrary, this source represents a later elaboration of Valentinus' original teaching, then this source together with other Valentinian sources give us a picture of Valentinianism in a form that is somehow remote from the teaching of its originator. A comparison between the Gospel of Truth and this elaborate form of Valentinianism reveals whether or not the former belongs to the Valentinian type of Gnosticism at all.[1]

In the event that the answer to the above question is positive, it then remains to establish the relationship of the Gospel of Truth to the original teaching of Valentinus himself. To attain that end, our method should be modified.

In the first place we must isolate the common Valentinian

---

[1]On the relationship between the Gospel of Truth and Valentinianism, see chap. vi.

teaching that underlies all available sources and see how far these may be traced back to the Founder of the School. Special attention should be paid to the so-called Oriental school which, by common agreement among scholars, stands closer to the teaching of the master. Above all, some of the most important of the few fragments of Valentinus should be carefully examined.

The final step will be to reread the Gospel of Truth against this new background in order to see its relationship to the doctrine of Valentinus and to the person of Valentinus himself.

The Fragments of Valentinus and Their Method of Interpretation

In discussing the few fragments of Valentinus which have reached us, we must bear in mind the problems involved in their interpretation.

If taken in isolation, the fragments appear quite meaningless. There is also little hope to correlate them among themselves into a coherent whole. Their only apparent affiliation to Valentinus is the fact that the ecclesiastical writers who have preserved them explicitly attribute them to the second century A.D. heresiarch, but these authors should have had a reason for attributing them to him. Considering their enigmatic character, which does not offer any ground for the creation of an explanatory theory, we must rely solely on the above information.

It is curious enough that the ecclesiastical writers have not preserved more extended parts of the writings of Valentinus, while they are more generous for Valentinian works of the second generation.

Perhaps they had no access to the original writings of Valentinus which remained hidden treasures of the Valentinian Church. They mention, however, Valentinus' works by name, and they have preserved for the generations to come eight fragments. Six of them occur in Clement of Alexandria's Stromata,[1] and two appear in Hippolytus' Refutatio.

Sagnard tries to interpret the fragments by projecting them against their general Valentinian background.[3] This background, however, should not be taken for granted. Sagnard reconstructs it on the basis of the Ptolemaic source and other Valentinian documents. Thus, Sagnard uses one hypothesis of his own in order to explain another. His hypotheses, however, are well documented by source material and they deserve our attention.

In the first place, he creates a general theory on Valentinianism by using the sources that he himself has isolated, and then, he uses his picture of Valentinianism as a frame of reference in order to explain individual pieces of information that he takes out of the same sources.

One should have expected to see Sagnard formulate his general theory following the inductive method, and on the basis of the

---

[1]Clemens Alexandrinus II, Stromata I-VI, ed. Otto Stählin (3d ed.; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960), Fragment I: Strom. ii. 36. 2-4; Fragment II: Strom. ii. 114. 3-6; Fragment III: Strom iii. 59. 3; Fragment IV[a]: Strom. iv. 89. 1-3; Fragment IV[b]: Strom. iv. 89. 6-90.

[2]Wendland, citing Hippolytus Refutatio vi. 37. 6-8 with reference to Fragment VIII.

[3]Sagnard, Études de Philosophie Médiévale, XXXVI (1947), 565-66.

particular details, as it is customary in positive sciences. His method, however, is basically philological and historical, and he applies it to sources of a very complicated nature. He tries to verify his theory point by point; this method of verification includes an element of circular thought. He tries to interpret scattered pieces of information on the basis of a preconceived theory, and at the same time, he attempts to very this theory on the basis of elements that he has not otherwise clarified. Thus, Sagnard's method is an interplay between deduction and induction.

Beyond this method of reconstruction, however, there is a solid philological background which entitles Sagnard to the right of a certain speculation. We must admit that in the final analysis, historical reconstruction is an artistic creation. What the above method brings to light, however, can be submitted to verification and this a posteriori verification is in itself a check and an evidence of the validity of the conclusions.

The fragments of Valentinus, and in particular Fragment I, will be the pivots of our method of inquiry. They are authentic Valentinian works and if the original doctrine of Valentinus is identified at all it must primarily be based on Valentinus' fragments. They are few but, as this thesis will make clear, even one of them, i.e., Fragment I, includes in essence an element of the cosmology and of the psychology of Valentinus so that its historical value becomes immeasurable. It is on the basis of these fragments and, above all, of the most important Fragment I that the writer intends to reconstruct the cosmology of Valentinus which he

believes is the projection of his psychology. Sagnard's reconstruction of the general Valentinian framework is the necessary frame of reference for their interpretation.

The fragments of Valentinus have a bearing upon the reconstruction of Valentinianism and the teaching of Valentinus himself. Sagnard considers "un resultat décisif"[1] that the Valentinian fragments correspond to the other Valentinian documents of which he gives an over-all presentation.[2] He uses them, however, only as a means of verification and as a "pierre de touche"[3] for the other source materials he has used. That means that the fragments offer nothing new that is not otherwise known through the other Valentinian sources. The fragments confirm the general Valentinian scheme of thought with its fundamental ideas and associations and, in turn, they themselves are interpreted in terms of that scheme.

Quite independently of the question of the authorship of the Ptolemaic sources, this outline, as Quispel points out in general terms, may go back to Valentinus himself. But this is not all. The fragments, Quispel believes, reveal a personal artistic talent.

Sagnard agrees with Quispel on the personal character of the fragments.

> Interpretés dans le sens le plus philosophique qui soit possible, ils (les fragments) peuvent traduire la valeur absolue de l'expression artistique, qui dépasse la constitution matérielle et la proportion mathématique des lignes, pour révéler d'un modele ideal, vivant, préexistant;[4] ils enseignent l'immortalité des

---

[1] Ibid., p. 561.

[2] Ibid., p. 565.

[3] Sagnard, Sources Chretiennes, XXIII, 126.

[4] Fragments I and IV[b].

> hommes,[1] la préeminence de l'ésprit;[2] exigent la purification du coeur.[3] Tout ceci, dans un style agréable, brillant même, dont les pères-y compris Tertullien-ont tenu à souligner le charme.[4]

Quispel, without pretension of presenting a complete theory, declares that "the Valentinian [Valentinus'] doctrine was a systematic conception of the universe, poetical, but not disorderly, heretical, but not confused."[5] "On the whole this metaphysical poem seems inspired by vivid emotions and personal experiences. Valentine was neither a philosopher nor a theologian, but rather a visionary mystic, who expressed his tragic conception of life in the symbols of creative imagination."[6] This poem is the common text between Theodotus who lived in the East and Ptolemy who lived in the West. The texts are the Ptolemaic sources of the Excerpta and the data from Irenaeus j. 11 that Quispel combines with the fragments of Valentinus.

Thus, both Sagnard and Quispel, working independently from one another and starting from different presuppositions, combine the fragments with the common source to Theodotus and Ptolemy and stress the presence of two basic elements. The first is that there is an outline of Valentinian doctrine that may be drawn from both the fragments and the source in question. This outline appears when the sources are correlated. Secondly, the outline, and in particular the

---

[1] Fragment IV[a].

[2] Fragment IX.

[3] Fragment II.

[4] Sagnard, Sources Chretiennes, XXIII, 122

[5] Quispel, p. 47

[6] Ibid.

fragments, offer the marks of a strong poetical personality. Clement and Hippolytus attribute these fragments to Valentinus himself. Consequently, internal evidence, even though somehow forced due to the scarcity of the sources, and external evidence, namely, the witness of the above-mentioned fathers who knew the early stages of Valentinian tradition, and, in this respect, exhibit no doctrinal interest, hint to two points--the Valentinian authorship of the fragments and the authenticity of the doctrinal outline.

The personal element of the fragments, I believe, guarantees the authenticity of those elements that are common to the fragments of Valentinus and to the other Valentinian sources. It attests, first, to the Valentinian authorship of the fragments themselves and secondly, to the ultimate origin of the doctrinal outlines of the other sources which, by the same token, may be traced back to the author of the fragments themselves.

CHAPTER III

THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND ITS SYNCRETISTIC ENVIRONMENT

A fundamental principle of interpretation of an ancient document is its projection against the general and special background where it belongs. That means the necessity of a reconstruction of the environmental factors which influenced its writing. Individual contribution cannot be separated from the social factors which influenced the development of a creative personality within a historical development. Individuals may be original but they are also socially conditioned.

The Gospel of Truth and its author cannot make an exception to the rule. All the factors which created the individuality of the second century A.D. must be considered in its interpretation and since the document is of religious character, the reconstruction of the religious framework or frameworks within which it appeared must become an object of study.

The method of historical reconstruction is generally accepted today for a work of introduction to a certain ancient writing. It was applied first by Wellhausen to the interpretation of the Old Testament and then transferred by the same and other scholars to the New Testament.

There must be a distinction, however, between the short period of time under which the Early Christian Church and its literature developed, and the centuries of slow evolution which produced the religious syncretism of the period of the Empire. Emphasis, therefore, must be laid upon the immediate Valentinian environment where the Gospel of Truth belongs and its wider circle, the Christian Gnostic movement of which it is a part. Any generalization that will ignore this immediate area of development must be avoided and any attempt of reconstruction must be based on literary and other sources.

Among the various factors that have been emphasized in connection with the growth of Gnosticism is Iranian Dualism, but at least in the case of our tractate we must not ignore possible influences from the Far East, since the presence of the Hindu factor in the melting pot of the International Port of Alexandria, Egypt, is well attested long before the rise of the Christian Church.

This chapter will be devoted to the examination of the problem of reconstruction of the religious and philosophical environment within which the Gospel of Truth was written, the evaluation of the Form Critical Method that has been suggested for its interpretation, and the Hindu influence hypothesis.

Sitz im Leben

In an article published in 1963 under the title "Le Sitz im Leben de l'Evangile de Verité," Jacques Ménard,[1] the author of a

---

[1]Jacques Ménard, "Le Sitz im Leben de l'Evangile de Verité,"

Greek retroversion and of a commentary on the same document that appeared a year earlier, tries to reconstruct the spiritual and intellectual environment within which the Gospel of Truth arose. He projects Gnosticism in general and the EV[1] he considered the quintessense of Gnosticism, in particular, against the broader background of religious and philosophic thought of the late Hellenistic and early Roman centuries.[2] The Gnostic thought of the EV he considers as the hellenization of Oriental theories that already existed in the East and, at the same time, the paganization for a second time of the content of the Bible and the doctrine of the Christian Church.[3]

He places the date of the EV around A.D. 150, namely in a time that preceded the "Golden Age" of Gnosticism to which Valentinianism belongs.[4] He considers Gnosticism as a natural reaction of the religious mystical experience of men during the first centuries of the Christian Era, which he describes in the following terms.

The period of the Empire is marked by its need of God, a profound sense of the existence of Evil, a self-conscious acceptance of human weakness and corruption, as well as a necessity for redemption and union with God. These were genuine needs of human nature, stronger than materialism and rationalism even though they were hid-

---

Studia Monte Regis, VI (1963), 57-66.

[1]EV is hereafter cited as an abbreviation for Evangelium Veritatis.

[2]Ménard, Studia Monte Regis, VI (1963), 57.

[3]Ibid., p. 66.

[4]Ibid., p. 57.

den under much superstition and absurdity.[1]

The various religions of that period had little to offer to quench the spiritual thirst of their contemporaries, but on the contrary, the individual was seeking assistance from a more complex type of religion, which borrowed its elements from various cultures, such as Greek, Egyptian, Iranian, and Semitic.[2]

This new religion was oriented towards monotheism. God was transcendent and demons and angels functioned as demons, angels, and saints do in Judaism and Christianity.[3]

Religion tended to become philosophy and philosophy itself, while individualized as religion itself, was losing much of its rational and scientific character. Arithmetic, geometry and music, for instance, are rejected in Asclepius[4] of the Corpus Hermeticum,[5] and science here came to be considered a gift from God.[6] The "Dialogue" type of discussion, known from the writings of Plato, is used in "Hermeticism" as conversation between a neophyte and a mystagogue. Philosophy became a practical guide to religion and ethics and a personal experience of contemplation and knowledge of God.[7]

The apogee of this type of philosophical thinking is represented by Plotinus, while the ideas and feelings of the average man

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 58.

[3] Ibid., pp. 58 and 62.

[4] Asclepius 12-13.

[5] Corpus Hermeticum is hereafter cited as CH.

[6] CH x. 9.

[7] Ménard, Studia Monte Regis, VI (1963),58.

found their expression in astrology and magic. Magic reached its climax during the first century A.D.[1]

Magic contributed considerably to the development of the Coptic language which used the Greek alphabet with additions from the Demotic Egyptian vernacular. Coptic, the language of the manuscripts of Chenoboskion, was probably born in the already judaized environment of Upper Egypt.[2]

Magic itself was indebted to various sources, such as Greek, Babylonian, Iranian, and the Gnostic, Orphic and Neophythagorian groups.[3] Magic can be considered as the practical and utilitarian exploitation of the upper world, while Gnosticism was trying to explain it. There were, however, higher tendencies in magic.[4]

Magic was not separated from the religions of that time; it represented a lower level of religious thought. On the contrary, the Sibylline Oracles and Hermeticism represented the experience of the average man. For former represented Greek eclecticism and hellenistic syncretism under Jewish and Christian adjustments. The latter stands between Plotinus and magic literature and again expresses Greek eclecticism, but also Jewish and Iranian ideas.[5]

Hermetic literature preaches deliverance from Fate or Heimarmenē through knowledge and understanding of God, as well as immortality and fusion with God. It stresses monotheism, and the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 59.

[2] Ibid., pp. 59, 60, and 65.

[3] Ibid., p. 60.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., pp. 61-62.

goodness of God, moral life, regeneration, and control over the bodily desires as a prerequisite for the vision of God.[1]

This is the type of Greek culture that, according to Ménard, influenced early Christian Gnosticism and in particular the Gnostic doctrines represented by the writings of Nag Hammâdi.[2]

There were other contributions, however, to hellenistic syncretism, and Judaism should be mentioned among the first. There were already Jews in Egypt during the period of El Amarna, namely, in the middle of the thirteenth century B.C., during the time of Amen-Hotep IV who undertook monotheistic reform. Even before the Greek occupation of Egypt there were Jewish communities in the Thebaide and their number, of course, increased during the period of the Ptolemies. By the middle of the first century A.D., Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, maintained that there were more than a million Jews in Egypt during his life time.[3]

The Greek translation of the Old Testament, known as the Septuagint, was in use not only among the Alexandrian Jews but also among the gentiles, Greek and Roman. It became the means by which Jewish religious ideas reached the gentile world.[4]

On the other hand, Hellenism influenced the thought not only of the Jews of Alexandria but even of those in Palestine and this in spite of the Maccabean Orthodox reaction. The Essenes, in

---

[1] Ibid., p. 62.

[2] Ibid., p. 63.

[3] Philo In Flacc. vi. 43.

[4] Ménard, Studia Monte Regis, VI (1963), 64.

Palestine, betray Neopythagorean influences and the fourth book of Maccabees, written under Emperor Hadrian by an Orthodox Alexandrian Jew, has Stoic ideas.[1]

Philo is the dominant figure among the Alexandrian Jews. He constitutes a link between Hellenism and Judaism. Being a Platonist himself, even though colored with Stoic ideas, he interpreted Jewish ideas and experiences in terms of Greek thought. In that way he brought his own people into contact with the currents of Hellenic idealism, while he made accessible his religious heritage to the Greeks. He is responsible for the presentation of the Hebrew notion of Wisdom in terms of the Greek Logos, or "Divine Reason." His role within Judaism can be compared to that of Clement within the Christian Church, and he found followers in Origen and the medieval Christian theologians.[2]

Ménard concludes that these are the two major cultures of Alexandria which have exercised the most impressive influence upon the writings of Nag Hammâdi and on the Gospel of Truth. We must consider, however, the Oriental factor.[3]

Among the Oriental influences on Alexandrian culture, Ménard mentions Hinduism. In the third century B.C. Emperor Asoka sent out Buddhist missionaries to Ptolemy II. Hindu languages were spoken in Alexandria by Hindu peoples, and there was trade and exchange of ideas between Egypt and the Far East. The Palestinian Essenes and

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., pp. 64-65.

[3] Ibid., p. 66.

the Egyptian Therapeutae may be indebted to Buddhism through the indirect mediation of Judaism or Hellenism.[1]

This is the environment within which we must locate the Gospel of Truth in order to interpret it. This environment consists of Greek, Judaic, and Oriental elements. The method of the Sitz im Leben is not new. It has been used already by Wellhausen in connection with Gospel criticism and is related to tradition or form criticism of the Gospels which is ultimately nothing else than a reconstruction of the milieu in which the Christian tradition arose and grew.

The Form Critical Method Evaluated

In principle Ménard's method is sound but we must make some remarks on it. In the first place, it is to oversimplify the problem by projecting it against the general background of, let us say, six centuries, from the beginning of Ptolemaic Egypt to almost the days of Constantine the Great; the Sitz im Leben, as applied to the Canonical Gospels, covers the span of two or three generations at most.

Tradition criticism in the case of the Gospels does not eliminate literary criticism of the same documents. Ménard considers it more helpful to relate the Gospel of Truth to the general stream of religious philosophic thought which he tries to reconstruct in very general and vague terms in his article, than to

---

[1] Ibid. See also P. D. Moncrieff, Paganism and Christianity in Egypt (Cambridge: The University Press, 1913), p. 18.

determine Gnostic influences upon it from sects such as the Naasene, the Ophite, or that of Simon the Magician.

The question remains whether we are ready to give up the examination of literary interrelationships and particular ideological affinities in favor of generalizations. If not, why not also apply the genetic historical method to the Gospel of Truth? Can we ignore this method in the study of the general phenomenon of hellenistic syncretism which poses the question of the differentiation of the various traditions in terms of philosophy and history?

The reconstruction of the general environment of the EV also differs from the application of the method to the Gospels in that here we are trying to reconstruct the special milieu of the Christian communities, and only then we are examining the question of the general environmental influences on them. It is, however, helpful as long as it runs parallel to the reconstruction of the literary sources and other possible influences. After all, the possibility of the development of an oral tradition within the Gnostic communities expressed in terms of a more or less definite technical vocabulary, namely, a vocabulary which is not specifically Gnostic but has a special function within the Gnostic communities, must not be overlooked, and this is the field where in spite of Ménard's suggestion, we should continue to work.

There must be a distinction between the place where the Gospel of Truth was discovered and probably translated and the place where it was originally written. Van Unnik, on the basis of the method of counting the numbers 1-99 with the left hand, and

from 100 and up with the right hand, has already concluded that the EV, which has this method of counting numbers in connection with the parable of the lost sheep, was probably written in the West, possibly in Rome. This way of counting occurs only among Latin writers.[1] The argument, it seems to me, still holds valid.

As far as Hermeticism is concerned, the Nag Hammâdi findings, which include certain Hermetic tractates, have shown that the Gnostic community of Chenoboskion included Hermetic writings during the third and fourth centuries A.D. The writings must have been translated earlier. With the exception of Poimandres, however, which may go back to the second half of the second century A.D., the Hermetic tractates are of a later date, some of them reaching even the Muslim Era. Therefore, they post-date the Gospel of Truth and cannot explain it. If the Corpus Hermeticum has incorporated earlier materials which were in vogue in the second century, A.D., and if some of these ideas are reflected in the Gospel of Truth, the latter and not the Corpus Hermeticum should be considered as the earliest evidence to these ideas. Because of these differences in dates, in the course of this study, I am not considering the possible influence of the CH on the Gospel of Truth. It is on the basis of this, however, that Ménard reconstructs the milieu of the Gospel of Truth.

The Hindu Influence Hypothesis

The Hindu hypothesis, on the other hand, is a positive con-

---

[1]Van Unnik, The Jung Codex, pp. 96-97.

tribution to the understanding of the Gospel of Truth. There are some elements in the Gospel of Truth which definitely remain Hindu ideas. Some of them are discussed below.

The general conception of the world as an illusion is expressed in terms of a parable, the parable of the Nightmare, which echoes a Hindu myth that expresses the illusionary character of the world.[1]

The idea of a tree having its roots turned upwards occurs in EV 28. 16; 41. 17 seqq.; 42. 33 and corresponds in Hinduism to a similar idea expressed in one of the Uppanishads. It is related to the nightmare parable, and both symbolize the World Soul, human situations and also the individual soul of man.[2]

The emphasis on "Knowledge" as a means of salvation is identical to that found in the Vedânta, where salvation derives from "Knowledge" (Jñânān Mokshah).[3]

The Vedânta developed early in the Christian era, but reflects earlier tradition. The Hindu philosopher, Çankara (A.D. 728-788), known as the Hindu Thomas Aquinas, states the following ideas which may summarize the fundamental tenets of the Gospel of Truth:

> There is only one single Absolute Reality, the Brahman, and outside the Brahman, there is nothing which actually and genuinely exists. The entire world which we behold is a cosmic illusion. . . . It is not until we attain a true

---

[1]Helmer Ringgren, "Evangelium Veritatis och den Valentinianska Gnosis," Religion och Bibel, XVII (1958), 45-53.

[2]Ibid., p. 53.

[3]Paul Deussen, The System of the Vedânta (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1912), p. 475.

knowledge that we find salvation and deliverance from the deception in which we are entangled.[1]

The image of the reversed tree appears in Bhagavad-gita:[2]

> There is a fig [Banyan] tree
> In ancient story,
> The giant Aswattha,
> The everlasting,
> Rooted in heaven,
> Its branches earthward:
> Each of its leaves
> Is a song of the Vedas,
> And he who knows it
> Knows all the Vedas.
>
> Downward and upward
> Its branches bending
> Are fed by the gunas,
> The buds it puts forth
> Are the things of the senses,
> Roots it has also
> Reaching downward
> Into this world,
> The roots of man's action.
>
> What its form is,
> Its end and beginning,
> Its very nature
> Can never be known here.

The above verses render the idea of being a Gnostic with his roots in heaven. We must be careful, however, not to jump to conclusions as to the general character of Valentinianism in relation to the cosmology of the Gita. The following quotation will clarify the situation:

> Being absolutely present, Brahman is within all creatures and objects. The Godhead is present in man, in the mouse, in the

---

[1]Alan Coates Bouquet, Hinduism (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1948), p. 48.

[2]The Song of God: Bhagavad-gita, trans. Swami Probhavananda and Christopher Isherwood (Hollywood: Vedânta Press, 1961), p. 146.

> stone, in the flash of lightning. Thus considered, Brahman is called the Atman--a term of convenience merely, which does not imply the slightest difference. The Atman and Brahman are one.[1]

A stone, according to Valentinian interpretation, is the outcome of the solidification of the passions of Sophia; therefore, in the final analysis the stone goes back to the divine nature. Is there, however, any spirit in it? Will it return to its original source? According to Valentinian eschatology the material world is doomed to perish in fire. What has been said of the stone holds also true for the mouse. It, too, is of divine origin, but no psychic, or animal nature will enter the Pleroma, and even psychic man is excluded from it. This difference from the cosmology of the Gita should be noted.

---

[1] Ibid., Appendix I, pp. 177-85.

CHAPTER IV

THE LITERARY CHARACTER OF THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH

THE GOSPEL POEM

One of the problems that the newly discovered Gospel of Truth presents is that of its literary character. By this I mean three major problems: the language of the document--the question whether it is prose, poetry or both; and the particular philological type to which it belongs.

The language problem appears under a dual form. The Jung Codex is a Coptic papyrus, but the original language of the writings it includes is Hellenistic Greek. Modern language translations create a further step of estrangement from the original Greek. The same might be said for the restoration of the Greek original on the basis of the present Coptic text. This, however, could be accepted under certain conditions since, on the one hand, the Coptic text has preserved part of the original Greek vocabulary and, on the other, the text is full of technical Valentinian terms that are easily recognizable.

The problem of poetry, prose or both, is a problem of literary unity of the writing that is for the first time suggested here. The writer suggests the presence of two superimposed layers--the one poetical, the other prosaic. He believes, however, that both go

back to the same mind, if not to the same pen, and that the prose serves as a commentary to a Gospel Poem that is freely used by the poet in his attempt to create a homily including a Gospel text and an exegetical commentary based on it.

The Gospel Poem and certain parts of the hemiletical material[1] belong to the now well-known Gospel type of literature. As such, they include Kerygma and Didache. At the same time, however, in deviation from anything known about this type of literature, the Gospel is meant to be cryptic and esoteric and not an open proclamation. All these problems will be discussed in this chapter; however, the central point of the discussion is the reconstruction of the Gospel Poem in a tentative Greek form which cannot be considered as identical to the original but, as the writer believes, a close approximation to it.

The Language of the Gospel of Truth

The original language of the Gospel of Truth is beyond doubt Greek. This can be shown not only on the basis of the many Greek terms that the Coptic translator has preserved, but also by the two wordplays which only in Greek are possible. These are: EV 36. 13-17: "Χριστόν ἔλεγαν, ἵνα χρίσῃ αὐτούς χρίσματι," "Christ

---

[1]The author has incorporated in his writing parables and discourses which are not poetical in character but constitute in themselves imitations of the equivalent elements in the canonical gospels. These may be later additions of the author to the original Gospel Poem and a broadening of the latter into a piece of literature including the Gospel, both in poetry and prose and a commentary. It is possible that this was done by the author or the redactor who might have used the prosaic Gospel material from the homilies of Valentinus.

they called him in their midst . . . that he should anoint them with Unction."[1] The wordplay lies in the interplay of the words Christ and Chrism which in Greek are derived from the same root.

The second is EV 36. 18: "τό δέ ἔλαιον, τό ἔλεος τοῦ Πατρός, ὅς ἐλεήση αὐτούς." Segelberg thinks that the word for Unction was "ἔλαιον" and translates it with oil, while Ménard has chrism: "τό χρῖσμα, τό ἔλεος τοῦ Πατρός τοῦ ἐλεήσαντος αὐτούς." Oil and mercy in Greek have different spellings but exactly the same pronunciation.[2]

The language of the manuscript that contains the Gospel of Truth is Coptic. While ten codices found in the same place as the Jung Codex are written in Sahidic, which is a Coptic idiom of Upper Egypt, the Jung Codex is entirely written in Subâkhmîmic. The Codex was probably introduced to the Sethian Library of Nag Hammâdi, from the Thebaide in the North where, according to Epiphanius[3] there were still Valentinians in the fourth century A.D.[4]

Subâkhmîmic is a form of the Coptic Âkhmîmic. Together with the Memphitic[5] and the Fayumic, the Âkhmîmic constituted the lan-

---

[1]Sören Giversen, Thomas Evangelium (Kopenhagen, 1955), p. 154.

[2]Eric Segelberg, "Evangelium Veritatis: A Confirmation Homily and Its Relation to the Odes of Solomon," Orientalia Suecana, VIII (1959), 3-42.

[3]Epiphanius Panarion xxxi. 7. 1.

[4]Puech, Quispel, and Malinine, p. xi.

[5]This Memphitic is different from the Memphitic Coptic which earlier characterized the Bohairic of Alexandrian Coptic.

guages that were in use in the Fayum, in Middle Egypt, west and south of Memphis at the head of the Nile Delta, and south of the Delta. The other two Coptic dialects are the Dialect of Upper Egypt, known as Sahidic which was centered around Thebes, the capital of the ancient Middle Egyptian kingdom, and Bohairic, the language of Alexandria and of the area of the Nile Delta.

Subâkhmîmic is also the language of a papyrus of the Gospel of John, published by Th. Thompson in 1924. We know that the Valentinians used the fourth Gospel and it is advisable to study comparatively the Subâkhmîmic of the Gospel of Truth and that of the Johannine papyrus. Furthermore, a study of the Johannine passages in the Gospel of Truth in connection to the Johannine text of the papyrus might reveal the type of text the Valentinians were using in the areas where Subâkhmîmic was used.

Since the Gospel of Truth is the first extant Valentinian work that we possess, its Gospel text must be seriously considered. The alternative is the texts preserved by the Church Fathers who have included Valentinian fragments in their writings or give us information on Valentinian doctrine. The Coptic translation of the Gospels and the other New Testament texts preserved in the Gospel of Truth and the original Greek that lies behind are excellent means by which we may check the patristic biblical texts.

Retranslation into Greek

J. E. Ménard has retranslated the Coptic text of the Gospel

<u>of Truth</u> into Greek.[1] The Greek text thus reconstructed is, of course, hypothetical and presents all the merits and drawbacks of the same method in the retranslation of the New Testament into Aramaic or Hebrew.

Thus the new Greek translation is another modern translation remote from the Greek original by a further step, the first being the Coptic translation. We must consider the fact, however, that the Coptic translator, due to the poor vocabulary of the Coptic language, has preserved intact many Greek words. These words have suffered no alteration in the process of the two translations.

Furthermore we must remember that the Valentinian doctrine is full of technical terms. These terms are easily recognizable and, therefore, Ménard, equipped as he is with the knowledge of Valentinian terminology, had no difficulty in identifying the technical terms.

The same terms, on the other hand, once in Greek, regain their full semantic value and at a glance create in the mind of the reader all the particular Valentinian connotations and interrelationships.

This study claims to have identified a second layer within the <u>Gospel of Truth</u> which is possibly poetical in form. It is surprising how easily the Greek terms fit each other in order to form a verse. That means that the Coptic translation has not gone far from the original Greek and also that the method of retransla-

---

[1]Jacques E. Ménard, <u>L'Évangile de Verité: Rétroversion Grecque et Commentaire</u> (Paris: Letouzey Ané, 1962).

tion into Greek due to the limitations of the Coptic language is basically sound.

Poetry in the Gospel of Truth

R. Harris mentions at least three second century A.D. Psalters in addition to the Odes of Solomon, which he dates early in the second or even late in the first century A.D.[1] These are the Psalters of Marcion, of Valentinus, and of Bardaisan.

From Tertillian De Carne Christi xx. we learn about Valentinus' Psalter: "Nobis quoque ad hanc speciem Psalmi patrocinabuntur, non quidem apostatae et haeretici et Platonici Valentini, sed sanctissimi et receptissimi prophetae David." The point at issue is the body of Christ. Tertullian insists that it was born of Mary, that is from the mother's womb, and he asks the support of David for his teaching, rejecting Valentinus' opposite docetic teaching. That means that the birth of Christ had become a matter of poetical expression in Valentine's poetry. Reference to the body of Christ is made in EV 23. 31 and 31. 5.

Assuming at this stage of our inquiry that Valentinus is the author of the Gospel of Truth, we may look for traces of poetry in the latter.

The Jung Codex makes no differentiation between poetry and prose. Since the Codex includes a translation, it can be explained why poetry and prose have been confused, even though the confusion

---

[1]Rendel Harris and Alphonse Mingana, The Odes and the Psalms of Solomon (2d ed. rev.; New York: Longmans, 1920), II, 160.

is not complete, as we shall see later in this study.

The nature of our document, on the other hand, facilitates such a confusion. The Gospel of Truth is a combination of poetry and prose. This may be explained in two ways. Either it is a commentary to confessional pieces of poetry and, in this case, the commentary cannot be distinguished anymore from the poetical section it is meant to interpret, or it is prose with insertion of poetical references. Due to the fact, however, that the pieces of poetry that we have are preceded by introductory words or are followed by tedious explanations, it is more probable that these preludes, explanations, and the many parenthetic diversions, serve as literary frameworks and commentaries to fundamental, creed-like poems.

The difference in style is not only a difference between poetry and prose, but between two different styles--a good and a bad--since this "prose" betrays a "mauvaise rhetorique."[1] It betrays a poor writer, while the poetry reveals an able man. I suggest that the poet himself is freely quoting his own poems and comments on them in the manner of a preacher elaborating on a certain text. The tractate, then, includes a text to be interpreted and an homily on it.

Even though Melachthon is considered the originator of the synthetic sermon, synthetic speeches were known to the early Church from the sermons of Basil of Cesaraea, Cappadocia, Gregory of Nazi-

---

[1]Jean Doresse, Les livres secrets des Gnostiques d'Égypte (Paris, 1958), p. 254.

anzus, John Chrysostom, Ephrem the Syrian, Augustin, and others. However, due to the fact that the Bible was considered as the Word of God, a synthesis of human reasoning had little place in early Christianity and, therefore, the favored sermon form of the ancient fathers was the analytical exegetical method which explains a biblical text. The Valentinian Heracleon wrote a commentary on the Prologue of the Gospel of John and other Valentinians followed. Valentinus, in this, is in full accord with the practice of his age. The question, however, remains: how could an able poet be a poor prose writer, and if Valentinus never meant to write the Gospel of Truth, how can he have been a poor speaker? What we know from tradition contradicts this picture of Valentinus as a speaker.

The answer can be found in the fact that the Gospel of Truth was not meant to be written. It constitutes a series of notes taken, while Valentinus, or the "author," was speaking. Säve-Söderbergh, who insists on the homiletic character of the document, observes that the author never uses the word "write," but "speak." To this also corresponds the fact that in the Gospel a number of exhortations are present.[1]

The "homily" is an informal talk and this accounts for its irregular style with appositions within appositions. The contribution of the manuensis must also be considered, unless what we have in hand is a series of notes taken by a disciple with or without the knowledge and consent of the Master who, otherwise, might

---

[1]T. Säve-Söderbergh, "Det koptiska Evangelium Veritatis," Religion och Bibel, XVIII (1959), 23, 29.

have corrected the disciple's notes. Once the notes were taken, and the author was out of the picture, the notes could have been copied and used as a catechetical textbook and called a Gospel.

Poor speech, however, is not an easy solution to our problem, at least it is not any more than poor prose. If Valentinus is the "speaker," we know from Tertullian that "as to talent and eloquence he was an able man."[1]

There is a fact that no one can deny, namely, that the Gospel cannot be a public oration of Valentinus because of the esoteric and cryptic character. On the other hand, it is addressed to a group of people, the Catechumenes, who like the Catechumens of the Church were entitled to the knowledge of the essentials but not to the whole set of the doctrine of the group. This explains why the author passes in silence the structure of the Pleroma and declares that he is not supposed to say anything more (EV 43. 2).

Even this amount of permissible knowledge that the candidate to Valentinianism was given, is "spoken of," namely, imparted orally, as in certain secret societies today. The innermost group could know the names of the aeons, like the Essenes alone could share the knowledge of the names of the angels. If Irenaeus knows the details of the Pleroma we must remember that he writes at a later date when renegades from Valentinianism meanwhile had revealed things. This silence on the particulars of Valentinianism is one more evidence of the early date of the document.

---

[1]Tertullian De Prescriptione 30.

According to the above considerations the speech of the author is quite informal, hence its neglected style. It is a talk and even for great orators a talk is different from an oration. The conversational style of the document is transparent. The author is a pastor who addresses his flock in simple terms. Valentinus also was known for his hemiletical activity.

Since the Gospel is a homily, the task is imposed upon us to compare it with the hemiletical fragments of Valentinus which Clement has preserved in Stromata iv. 89. 1-3; iv. 89. 6-90; and vi. 52. 3-4. These are Fragments IV, V, and VI.

Fragment VI states: "this is the people of the Beloved, loved by him and loving him." The mutual love between the Father and the Gnostics is one of the major emphases of the Gospel of Truth. EV 43. 23 refers to the love of the Father for his worthy children, the Valentinians, a love which in EV 41. 34 expresses itself in terms of participation in the face of the Father and of embraces. It is true that Fragment VI refers to the love of the Beloved, namely, of Christ. It must be remembered, however, that it is through Christ and his gospel that ultimately the love of the Father is revealed to men, as EV 18. 14 makes clear. This love, on the other hand, is confined solely to a minority group, that of the "Perfect"; thus EV 18. 14 corresponds to the "people of the Beloved" of Fragment VI.

The emphasis on the beloved people finds its expression in the direct address made to that people in the second person, both in Fragment IV and in EV 32. 31-33. 18. In the former we

have a statement of Valentinus concerning the immortal nature of the people referred to as "you"; in the latter, admonitions and statements about the nature of the members of the beloved community who are addressed also as "you" and are characterized as the perfect day (EV 32. 32), as the children of Knowledge (EV 32. 38), as an Understanding that rescues (EV 33. 9) and as the sons of the Father (EV 33. 39).

Fragment V deals with the inferiority of this world to the world above or the "living Aeon." The theme is explained in exegetical terms starting with a rhetorical question and being followed by a detailed logical elaboration. It is remarkable that the homeletical parts of the Gospel are full of logical elaborations, often tedious and pedantic, exegetical explanations and further clarifications.

The comparison thus between the Gospel of Truth and the surviving fragments from Valentinus' homilies reveals a correspondence in style and rhetorical and exegetical manners. The same correspondence exists between the poetical Fragment VII, or "Harvest," and certain parts of our tractate in terms of parallelism of ideas and, perhaps, of meter. Thus, two sets of Valentinus' fragments--the homeletical and the poetical, correspond to the Gospel of Truth and hint to the identity of the author of both.

The man who put Valentinus' Gospel into writing should not have had trouble with his memory. The Gospel is a combination of a Gospel Poem and its prosaic exegesis. Poems have rhythm and meter, and they can be easily memorized. The Epics of Homer for

centuries were handed down from generation to generation orally and in the schools of the ancient Near East students memorized texts. The man who preserved for us Valentinus' poem and teaching must have been a devoted disciple who knew his subject and, in all probability, had learned by heart Valentinus' poem.

The Gospel is a combination of a Gospel Poem and its prosaic exegesis. Three hundred and fourteen verses have been isolated from the text of our tractate, and they constitute a Gospel Poem which includes a joyful message centered around the descent of the Logos as the good news or the Gospel proper in the primitive sense of the word, and also admonitions and instructions. The way the "Preacher" of this homily handles his poetical extracts clearly shows that the members of his audience were familiar with his poetry. Some of them may even have known it by heart. These guaranteed the trustworthiness of the scribe who wrote the Gospel. Once the Gospel became a public text, the disciples would have corrected the mistakes of the scribe, but in all probability the scribe was correct.

On the other hand, the poet of the Gospel Poem introduced no novelty when he cast his Gospel theme into verses. The Johannine Prologue was a precedent to him as a hymn to the Logos and was related to the fourth Gospel. Valentinus and the Valentinians used and interpreted this Prologue, and it was legitimate for Valentinus to use poetry as a means of expression of his message.

The poetical form would be the best means of missionary

propaganda among the masses. Poems are easily memorized and occasionally may be associated with music which makes the memorization even more easy. Arius composed his Thaleia Poem as a means to propagate his doctrine, and Valentinus preceded him. Cyril of Jerusalem used some of the Odes of Solomon for the same purpose, combining thus prose and poetry for the preparation of the Jerusalem catechumenes for Baptism.

The Gospel Poem, on the other hand, may have been used as a liturgical hymnal for several occasions and in particular for the ceremony of Baptism to which the writing refers. As such, only under its Greek form it might be used since, as our Coptic translation clearly shows, the poetry hardly survives the process of translation.

It was while reading the English translation that the writer all of a sudden saw what was underlying his complicate text. He noticed a difference in style which asked for an explanation. Certain parts of the text are smooth and elegant, others are extremely complicated. All modern translations preserve that difference which means that it is in the Coptic. I am giving here just one example from the introductory lines to the tractate that I have checked with Professor W. W. Isenberg of Concordia College, River Forest, Illinois, who is the author of a translation of the Gospel of Truth from the Coptic into English.[1] He verified the

---

[1]Robert M. Grant (ed.), Gnosticism: A Source Book of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period (New York: Harper, 1961), pp. 146-61.

complexity of style in the passage under discussion, and concurs with the present writer in his interpretation of this very complex passage.

In simple terms the introductory words of EV 16. 31 seqq. would be as follows: "the Gospel of Truth is joy for those who have received the grace of knowing from the Father of Truth Him through the power of the Logos come forth from the Pleroma." All this covers four and one-half verses (EV 16. 31-35a). Five and one-half verses (EV 16. 35b - 17. 1), however, follow which, in terms of two clauses introduced by relative pronouns, further qualify the Logos as being immanent in the Thought of the Father or Pleroma, and as Saviour. The title Saviour is justified by a secondary clause introduced by the preposition "for," which itself is followed by two clauses the first justifying the justification to the "Saviour," and the second being the justification to that justification. Altogether we have three secondary clauses justifying one another and ultimately a title which itself belongs to one of two secondary clauses qualifying the Logos come forth from the Pleroma. The structure of this passage which has just one main clause is as follows: "The Gospel . . . is joy for those who have received the grace of knowing . . . Him through the power of the Logos, come forth from the Pleroma, who is immanent . . . who is He whom they call 'The Saviour,' for that is . . . which He is . . . for the Salvation of those who were ignorant . . . since this name . . . since it is a discovery. . . ." In connection with

these sentences, Grobel states that "the reference of pronouns is one of the greatest sources of ambiguity here as in all Coptic writings."[1] Behind the pronouns and the clauses they are introducing we have Greek participles which bring into relief the verbs and especially the main one. Thus in Greek the style would be less complex than the accumulation of secondary clauses but still we have altogether thirteen verses centered around a simple statement that the Gospel is joy for certain people and this stylistic structure is altogether different from other parts of the text where we have a parade of independent clauses following each other such as the confusion of the jars section in EV 26. 10-18 or the Logos hymn in EV 23. 18-32.

This difference in style is remarkable and points to a possible distinction between two separate strata in the text, a simple one which serves as a kind of scriptural text and a complicated one which uses several means of rhetoric and exegesis to expound the meaning of the former.

The text of simple style is in all probability a poetical text. This can be shown primarily by the parallelism of thoughts and ideas which prevail in it, and, secondly, in its retranslation into Greek by a certain rhythm which characterizes it, a rhythm which can easily be elaborated into meter. While the rhythm or meter proposition is hypothetical and is based on a tentative reconstruction, the parallelism of ideas is a surer guide to the poetry of certain sec-

---

[1]Kendrick Grobel, The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel. Translation from the Coptic and Commentary (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 35.

tions of our tractate, since they consist in ideas and thoughts and have been rendered by modern translations of the Coptic text.

What is important is that the only poetical work of Valentinus that has survived, the Harvest combines both parallelism of ideas and quantitative meter. The author was under the influence both of the Jewish Bible, probably under its Septuagint form, and of the classical poetical tradition. The Septuagint itself presents rhythm which occasionally may become actual meter and Valentinus could do the same. The Septuagint meter, however, is accentual, while the Harvest is quantitative or, at least, mixed.

The style of the author's prose with its several difficulties and explanations, repetitions and reviews, reminds some contemporary sectarian teachers of religion who grasp almost any opportunity to review their whole doctrine explaining and illustrating things over and over again in order to indoctrinate their interlocutor better. Our homily makes clear that the method is not new.

Valentinus' Poetry Reconstructed

What we know from Valentinus' actual poetry has been preserved for us by Hippolytus.[1] Wendland, following Hippolytus, calls it the "psalm" of Valentinus.[2]

The "psalm" is introduced by the word "θέρος" which means harvest and serves as a title. The word may also denote the musical pattern upon which the poem was sung. Such a use of the introductory

---

[1]Hippolytus Refutatio vi. 37. 6-8.

[2]Wendland, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, XXVI, 167-68.

word would be similar to the similar words at the head of the canonical psalms as "ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν" (psalms 9. 80 [81]). It denoted the musical pattern upon which the song was supposed to be sung, let us say, the song of the wine-press. The Byzantine Church has preserved this type of musical model in the so-called "προσόμοια" and the cantor who is familiar with one of them is able to sing any hymn which is moulded upon the same pattern. Festugière on the basis of this interpretation suggests that the poetry of Valentinus was sung, a view that coincides with the writer's approach.[1]

The "psalm" has been interpreted in terms of classical rhythmical or quantitative, as well as of later accentual meters. The former method has been followed by Wilamowitz, while the latter by Norden. Both points of view will be examined here, since they have a bearing upon the problem of the character of Valentinus' poetry. The "psalm" will be analyzed first in terms of classical meters and then of accentual meters. Quantitatively interpreted the "psalm" presents the following picture.

1	Πάν τα κρε / μά με να / Πνεύ μα τι / βλέ πω	a
2	πάν τα δ' ὃ / χού με να / Πνεύ μα τι / νό ω	a
3	σάρ κα μέν / ἐκ ψυ / χῆς κρε μα / μέ νην	b
4	ψυ χήν / δέ ἁ ἕ ρος / ἐξ ε χο / μέ νην	b
5	ἁ ἕ ρα / δέ ἐξ αἵ / θρης κρε μα / με νόν	c
6	ἐκ δε βυ / θοῦ καρ / δούς φε ρο / μέ νους	d
7	ἐκ μή / τρας δε βρε / φος φε ρό / με νόν	c

[1] André M.-J. Festugière, "Notes sur les Extraits de Théodote de Clément d'Alexandrie et sur les Fragments de Valentin," Vigiliae Christianae, III, No. 4 (October, 1949), 207.

This poem is characterized by rhyme, by parallelism of ideas in the Biblical manner, and by a reconciliation of quantitative to accentual meters. It also presents a significant stylistic similarity to a passage in the Gospel of Truth. There is a rhyme in our poem between the lines 1-2, 3-4, 5-7 with the possible inclusion of verse 6 which does not end in an identical but a very similar way. Thus, the rhyme sequence is a,a,b,b,c,d,c.

What is important for our study is the fact that Valentinus' small poem includes also Biblical parallelisms. Verses 1-2 and 6-7 constitute a synonymic parallelism, while verses 3-5, a gradual one. Verses 6-7 make a parallelism not only among themselves but the two together to verse 5, as Hippolytus' interpretation makes clear. The Harvest, therefore, is an evidence to the influence of Biblical poetry upon Valentinus who thus combined hellenistic meters with Biblical parallelisms. Parallelism also prevails in certain parts of the Gospel of Truth which creates a strong possibility that these parts are poetical. While meter disappears in translation, parallelism survives because it is a correspondence of thoughts and ideas and one may suspect, on the basis of it, a poetic original.[1]

---

[1]Parallelism is not an exclusive Hebrew poetical feature. The Babylonians, Chinese, Egyptians, Arameans, Phoenicians, and the Greeks knew it. Among the Greeks, Theognis used it in verses 106, 633, 637 and 645 and Moschos in eidyll. A 1-2, 3. 4, 14, 15, 48, 49. The Gorgian and isokrateian schemes are also forms of parallelism. The Hebrews, however, made it the main expression of their poetical inspiration and elaborated its various forms. Παναγιώτου Ἰ. Μπρατσιώτου, Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τήν Παλαιάν Διαθήκην (Ἀθῆναι: By the Author, 1950), p. 271, n. 1.

Parallelism consists in a correspondence of thoughts. When in the second part of the verse the same idea is repeated in different words we have synonymic parallelism; when an opposite, antithetic parallelism; when the thought is further elaborated by the addition of new elements, prosthetic or synthetic parallelism; finally, when

Valentinus might have known the form of parallelism of ideas from sources other than the Bible, i.e., from Egyptian and Greek sources. We do know, however, that the Gnostics made use of the Bible and that the early Church used the Septuagint as its own Bible. Valentinus is familiar with Jewish Christianity, as his affinities with the Shepherd of Hermas and Justin make clear. It does not mean, however, that Valentinus was necessarily familiar with the Hebrew text because Jewish Christianity outside Palestine used Greek instead of Aramaic, and the Septuagint instead of the Hebrew text. On the other hand, Christian poetry already in the first century A.D. was imitating Biblical parallelistic forms as we can see it in some of the poems which have been incorporated in the books of the New Testament.

The Gospel of Truth shows a deep acquaintance with most of the books of the New Testament and also with many of the Old, especially with those of the Wisdom literature. Because of this it might have imitated Biblical poetry. Within the seven surviving verses of the Harvest, on the other hand, Valentinus has already two kinds of parallelism which means that he had cast his little poem into biblical parallelistic poetical patterns.

There is a stylistic similarity between Valentinus' Harvest

---

the meaning of the first part of the verse is completed in the second and a word or phrase of the previous part is repeated in the following, we can speak of gradual parallelism. We have examples of synonymic parallelism in the LXX Psalm 50. 9 and Lk 1. 47; of Antithetic parallelism in Psalm 1. 6 and Lk 1.52; of Prosthetic or Synthetic in Septuagint Psalm 103.2 and in Lk 1. 51, and of gradual parallelism in LXX Psalm 128. 1. Ibid., pp. 269-70.

and EV 31. 28-34. It consists in the fact that both have a series of objects or attributes depending or actually "hanging" from a main verb. In the Harvest, the objects "flesh," "soul," "air," "ether," "fruit," and "child" depend on the verbs βλέπω or νόω . In the above-mentioned passage of the Gospel of Truth eight verses are attributed to the verb of the first verse and depend on it:

31. 28 He became
Way for those who erred,
30 and Knowledge for those who were
ignorant; a Discovery for those who
sought and a Confirmation
for those who vaccilated;
an immaculate Innocence for those who
35 were defiled.

This stylistic parallel is significant for the problem of the authorship of the two documents and also for the problem of the poetical character of that passage of the Gospel of Truth. It occurs in a passage that the writer considers to be poetical.

The interpretation of the word "Harvest" as a title or as a musical reference support two emphases of the writer. First that the Gospel of Truth includes poetical parts that probably were sung just as much as Valentinus' Harvest and, secondly, that Valentinus follows Biblical patterns when he imitates the inscriptions of the psalms of the Septuagint. This statement will have a particular significance in the reconstruction of the "accentual" meter of the Harvest and of the poetical part of the Gospel of Truth.

From a metrical point of view this small "psalm" consists of seven verses which are in dactylic tetrameter with the last foot being trochaic except for verses 5 and 7 which are iambic. This metri-

cal construction belongs to Wilamowitz.[1] Two remarks are necessary here. In the first place, Wilamowitz amends the traditional text from ἐξεῖχομένην into ἐξ ἐχομένην in order to make the meter possible: "Man . . . darf das metrisch richtige verziehen." Secondly, he admits that there is in the poem a deviation from classical meters. In (κρε)μάμενα of v. 1 the first syllable has been mistakenly counted for long but he remarks that: "darin meldet sich die kommende accentuirende Poesie an."[2] The "psalm" also has many spondees, and three elisions.

Wilamowitz brings the "psalm" to the line of the quatrains from Oxyrynchos which were composed in the same meters.[3] These are dactylic tetrameters known as "miures" ending into a final iambic dactyl. Only two verses, however, i.e., verses 5 and 7 are iambic and the rest ends into trochaic dactyls. That means that the poem does not favor Wilamowitz's generalization. Since the preceding feet of each verse are dactylic, it is expected that the final feet are defective dactyls, namely trochees. The same would be possible for verses 5 and 7 but here we already are under the influence of the second grammatical tone of the words. In the case of the other verses grammatical tone and final quantitative dactyl coincide; here, however, once the discrepancy arose, the grammatical tone won the day and hence we have the final iambic. This is another instance where accentual rules make themselves evident within rhythmical structures.

---

[1] Ulrich von Wilamowitz und Möllendorf, "Lesfrüchte," Hermes, XXIV (1899), 218-19.

[2] Ibid., p. 219.

[3] Ibid.

The dactylic tetrameters or miures with iambic final dactyls were popular in the hellenistic age and their popularity was due to the ascendancy of the accentual meter. By the time Valentinus was writing his poem, the transition from long and short syllables to isochrony was at work.

On the other hand, it must be remarked that verses 1 and 2 as well as dactyl a of verse 3, a of verse 4 with the possibility of the inclusion of b, possibly dactyl a of verse 5 and dactyl a of verse 6 are both accentual and quantitative and this coincidence further weakens the argument in favor of the thoroughgoing quantitative aspect of the meter of the poem.

The major change of the Greek language consists in this introduction of isochrony of vowels, a quantity which gave vowels the same length of time and eliminated the accoustical distinction between long and short. This was the result of the expansion of the Greek language and its adoption by foreigners and took place during the hellenistic age. Pliny the Younger, in his letters to Trajan, transliterates into Latin the word "Χριστός" into Chrestus. Perhaps he had in mind a misspelling of the word "Χριστός" into "Χρηστός." If this is the case, we have evidence that there was no distinction between the letters η and ι in Bithynia, Asia Minor by the beginning of the second century A.D. Irenaeus preserved a Marcosian spelling of the same word Christ as "Χρειστός."[1] That means that by the 180's A.D. there was no distinction between ι and ει in sound. Sagnard remarks that at this time there was no distinction between the

---

[1]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 15. 1.

sounds of ι, ει, ηι and η .[1] The disappearance also of the distinction between and made the wordplay between "ἕλκος" and "ἔλαιον" possible in 36. 18.

Powel gives us an intermediate stage between quantitative or rhythmical and accentual articulation in the case of the "sailor's shanty" of the second century A.D.[2]

The Harvest shows a tendency to reconcile quantitative and accentual meters. This was the characteristic of the period of transition from the one type of meter to the other. It is true that Valentinus is a little early but the above-mentioned poem and Clement of Alexandria witness a conflict between quantity and accent. The conflict occurs on a larger scale in the Christian Sibylline Oracles in the second and third centuries A.D. and in the "Παρθένιον" of Methodius of Olympus at the end of the third century A.D.

A strong characteristic of the new metrical pattern is the accented penultimate. It is to be found in a Christian hymn preserved in the Amherst papyri, Plato II of the first half of the fourth century A.D., and in the Ad Virgines of Gregory of Nazianzus which is almost contemporary.[3] Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt remark that "accent being once firmly established in one part of the verse would not be slow in extending its influence."[4]

---

[1]Sagnard, Études de Philosophie Médiévale, XXXVI, 371.

[2]John U. Powel (ed.), "Lyrica Adespota," Collectanea Alexandrina (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 32.

[3]Gregory of Nazianzus, Ad Virgines.

[4]Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, The Amherst Papyri (London: Oxford Press, 1900), I, 24.

The accented next to the last syllable of the period of transition is a part of the dactylic tetrameter. It was widespread in the Hellenistic age and also occurs in the Harvest of Valentinus. This establishes a connecting link between the Hellenistic metrical tradition and the practices of the period of transition reflected already by Clement who was born at the time Valentinus was writing his poems. The Harvest serves as a bridge between the old and the new.

Valentinus may have been familiar, on the other hand, with more consistent accentual meters for two reasons. Valentinus lived in Rome and he might have been acquainted with the Latin language and poetry. Latin poetry usually followed a double metrical pattern, quantitative and accentual at the same time. On the other hand, he probably knew the Alexandrian translation of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint. The latter possibility includes a new orientation for our problem, for its importance the Septuagint factor must be given special attention here.

The importance of the Alexandrian translation of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint should not be minimized in any attempt to define the poetical habits of the early Christian poets. We can already see its influence in the poetical parts of the New Testament. It became the Bible of the early Christian Church before the books of the New Testament became canonized and its use by the Christians was not only theological but also liturgical.

The age of this translation is, beyond doubt, pre-Christian and its use was widespread by the beginning of the first century B.C. The translation was made in Alexandria, Egypt by various translators

at different times and on the basis of hermeneutical methods prevailing in that city.

What is important for our purpose is that the language of the Septuagint is Hellenistic Koine under its later form. It was the language of the common man of the age. If we wish to investigate the linguistic affiliations of that translation we must turn towards the direction of the Alexandrian populace rather than to the Alexandrian Museum and its grammarians. The Septuagint, therefore, is a first class monument which helps us to study the modifications of the Greek language.

In the case of the Septuagint Psalter we must consider the fact that the latter was meant to serve the liturgical needs of the Hellenistic Synagogue, as well as the devotional ones of the average Alexandrian Jew. The Psalter, therefore, being by its very nature a collection of religious poems, was rendered into Greek with the intention to remain what it was and to offer to the Alexandrian Jew the inspiration the Hebrew Psalter was giving to his Palestinian brother. The translation, therefore, was a kind of modernization of Jewish religion and as such it followed contemporary linguistic and poetical practices. The latter did not have to be those of the recognized conventional poetry. It would, therefore, be impossible for the translators of the Psalter not to try to offer to their psalms some kind of rhythm and poetical form. The translators are many and of a varying degree of education, but the poetical patterns used or sung in the streets of Alexandria were there to guide them.

The translators have, of course, preserved the various kinds

of Hebrew parallelism in their rendering of the original text. This was easy since parallelism consists in a correspondence of ideas rather than of sounds and syllables. The text of the Septuagint Psalter, however, exhibits occasional attempts to follow metrical patterns.

These patterns did not have to be prevalent from the beginning to the end of a psalm but this inconsistency is found elsewhere as well. As far as quantitative meter is concerned, Pindar and Bacchylides offer metrical variations. In the case of Pindar these variations "consist of the addition, omission, or repetition of certain elements, and of the transition to other unit sequences. The variety is so rich that it cannot be described in terms of rules."[1]

Timotheus' Persians, on the other hand, was written with complete freedom from traditional metrical units and it is altogether doubtful whether he meant to make use of the metrical archaic patterns.[2]

If Pindar can use a kind of free verse and Timotheus could neglect archaic metrical tradition it would be too much to expect from the unknown and obscure translators of the psalms to follow sophisticated rules. They belong to the masses of the people and they write for them. Metrical consistency was not their primary concern. Furthermore, the type of meter that the Greek text of the psalms can be submitted to is not the traditional rhythmical but the later accentual. This presupposes the elimination of the distinction between long

---

[1]James W. Halporn, Martin Ostwald, and Thomas G. Rosenmeyer, The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1963), p. 39.

[2]Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Mölendorf (ed.), Timotheos: Die Perser (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1903), col. v, ll. 191-209.

and short syllables. The objection to such a meter in the use of the Greek psalms may be that at the time the psalms were translated this pattern was not yet in use and, furthermore, that the equalization of the length of time of the vowels had not yet been achieved. Two answers can possibly be given to these objections.

In the first place we must make a distinction between conscious literary productions and popular creations. Septuagint translation belongs to the Hellenistic popular Koine and it should be distinguished from the literary "Koine." To confine our research to literary productions of the centuries that immediately precede or follow the appearance of Christianity is to neglect the powerful movements that were operating under the surface and which finally won the day. The Septuagint represents these movements.

The Septuagint psalms should be considered as representing the new modifications of the Greek language which won recognition in literary circles at a late period but must have established themselves much earlier. Since the date of the Septuagint psalms is unquestionably pre-Christian and since these psalms occasionally can be submitted to accentual patterns, it follows that these patterns are pre-Christian also and that the process of modification of the Greek language did not occur overnight--let us say at the time of Clement of Alexandria--but it had developed earlier, especially among non-literary circles. This being so the Septuagint must have exercised a great influence on Hellenistic Judaism and on early Christianity and through it on the whole process of the further development of the Greek language. To look, therefore, in the Septuagint for the ante-

cedents of second-century Greek and for early Christian poetry is not to place the cart before the horses but to start from a source of certain date and of unquestionable use. The metrical character of many passages of the psalms can easily be recognized. Its existence facilitated its affiliation with subsequent ecclesiastical music. The problem is different for the Latin Psalter because the Latin language has not known the sharp distinction between quantitative and accentual meters.

For purposes of illustration the examples of parallelism that already have been used will be reproduced with the purpose of showing that they can be subordinated to accentual meters.

Psalm 50:8

Ραν τι εἶς / με ὖσ σῶ / πρ
καί / κα θά / ρι σθή / σο μαι
πλυ νεῖς / με
καί / ὑ πέρ / χι ό / να λευ / κᾶν θή / σο μαι.

Line 1 is anapestic; lines 2, 3, and 4 are iambic.

Psalm 1:6

Ὅ τι / γι νώ / σκει Κύ / ρι ος
ὁ δόν / δι καί / ων
καί ὁ δός / ἁ σε βῶν / ἁ πω λεῖ / ται .

In line 1 the first foot is trochaic; the rest as well as line 2 are iambic. Line 3 is anapestic.

Psalm 103:2

Ἀ να / βαλ λό / με νος / φῶς
ὡς / ἱ μά / τι ον
ἐκ τεί / νων τόν / οὐ ρα νόν
ὡ σεί / δέρ ριν.

The whole verse is iambic with the exception of the last foot of line 3 which is anapestic and of the last foot of line 4 which is trochaic.

Prov. 20:2 Μή σέ πης/ τί σο μαι /τόν ἐχ θρόν
ἀλ λ'ὑ πό/ μει νον τόν/ Κύ ρι ον
ἵ να σοι /βο η θή /σῃ

Line 1 is a combination of two dactyls and a final anapest; line 2 is a combination of two anapests and one final dactyl; line 3 has one dactyl and the rest is anapestic.

Psalm 28:5 Φω νή /Κυ ρί /ου σύν /τρί βον /τος κέ/ δρους
συν τρί/ ψει Κύ/ ρι ός/ τάς κέ/ δρους τοῦ/ Λι βά/ νου

These two lines are thoroughly iambic with the exception of foot 4 of line 1 which is trochaic.

Psalm 128:1 Πλε ο νά /κις ἐ πο/ λέ μη σάν/ με ἐκ νε/ ό τη τός /μου
εἶ/ πά τω δή /'Ι σρα ηλ
Πλε ο νά /κις ἐ πό /λέ μη σάν/ με ἐκ νε/ ό τη τός/ μου
καί γάρ/ οὐκ /ἡ δυ νή /θη σάν μοι

These lines are thoroughly anapestic.

Parallel to the Septuagint meters and under the latter's influence are certain poetic passages of the New Testament. For illustration purposes a few cases of metrical patterns are given here.

Luke 1:47 Με γα λύ /νει ἡ ψυ χή /μου τόν Κύ/ ρι ον
καί /ἡ γαλ λί/ α σε τό πνεῦ/ μά μου
ἐ /πί τῷ /Θε ῷ
τῷ/ Σω τῆ/ ρι μου

With two cases of synizesis respectively in lines 1 and 2 we have the

following picture: lines 1 and 2 are anapestic, while lines 3 and 4 are iambic.

Luke 1:52 Κᾱ θεῖ / λε̄ δυ νά / στᾱς ἃ πό / θρό νων
καί / ὕ ψω σε̄ / τᾱ πε̄ νούς
πει / νῶν τᾱς ἐ / νέ πλη σεν / ἃ γα θῶν
καί πλου / τοῦν τᾱς / ἐ ξᾱ / πέ στει / λε̄ κε̄ / νούς

Line 1 is anapestic; line 2 includes a dactyl and an anapest; line 3 has 2 dactyls and a final anapest while line 4 is trochaic.

Luke 1:51 Ἔ ποί / η̄ σέ / κρά τος
ἐν / βρᾱ χί / ο̄ νί / Αὐ τοῦ
δι / ε̄ σκόρ / πι σεν / ὑ πε̄ / ρη φά / νους
δι ᾱ νοί / ᾱ καρ δί / ας αὐ τῶν

Line 1 combines two iambs with one final trochee; lines 2 and 3 are thoroughly iambic, while line 4 is anapestic.

The Magnificat of Luke inspired the Byzantine writer of hymns to compose his own Μεγαλυνάριον which I reproduce here with the purpose to show that it was Luke 1:47^{b} which influenced the meter of that hymn. The wording of the Lucan verse, in turn, is conditioned by I Sam. 2:1-10. Since the last part of the verse was meant to introduce the Byzantine hymn, the latter was given the meter of the last part of that introductory verse:

Luke 1:47^{b} τῷ / Σω̄ τῆ / ρί μου
Τήν / τι μι / ω̄ τέ / ραν
τῶν Χε / ροῡ βείμ
καί / ἐν δο / ξο̄ τέ / ραν ἃ / συγ κρί / τως
τῶν Σε / ρᾱ φείμ

τήν / ἅ δι / ᾱ φθό / ρως
Θε̄ ον Λό / γον τε̄ κοῦ / σάν
τήν ὕν / τως Θέ / ο τό / κον
Σέ μέ / γα λύ / νο μέν

The iambic foot is predominant in this hymn which is also the meter of Luke 1. One might object that the Byzantine poet projected the meters of his own day to the Lucan text. The answer to this is that the projection was not possible unless the Lucan text was offering the possibility of imposition upon it of such a meter. It is more natural to assume that Luke 1:47^{b} ends into an accentual and not a quantitative iambic meter and that it is Luke who is guiding the Byzantine poet and not that Byzantine metrical practices are read back into the text of Luke.

The influence of the Old Testament Septuagint's occasional accentual meters upon some of the New Testament poems and the latter's direct influence upon Byzantine hymnology make Norden's hypothesis unnecessary. Norden puts the Harvest of Valentinus on the same line of metrical development with the Hymn of the Naassenes, with one of Synessius of Ptolemais (d. after 413 A.D.) and with samples from Romanos.[1] If Norden's accentual interpretation of the metrical structure of the Harvest is correct the influence of the Septuagint and of the New Testament can explain it.

Romanos in the fifth century A.D. follows only the free rhythm of the accent of the words and his poetry had appeal to the

---

[1]Edward Norden, Die Antike Kunstprosa von VI Jahrhundert v. Christus bis in die Zeit der Renaissance II (2d ed. rev.; Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1909), p. 862 seq.

masses and imposed itself upon the Church's ritual. There were people, however, like Sophronius of Jerusalem, Pseudo-Maximus, and George Pisidas who wrote their poems in quantitative meters but destined them for a minority of learned people.[1] Quantitative meters were preserved by the Greek Church in the verses of the "Synaxaria" of the day in the Month books and in connection with the subject of the festival, mostly in cases of "Despotic" or Lord's festivals. Poetical productions in classical meters were not adopted in worship in view of the rising tide of the vernacular language and its new forms. The so-called "ἰαμβικαί καταβασίαι" are accentual with occasional combination with quantitative meter. Occasional quantitative meters have survived in the Hymnology of the Eastern Church which means that if later poets used quantitative meters, Valentinus might have done just as well as his Harvest. The latter was a kind of confession of faith, a summary of his religious philosophy and could be cast into more conventional patterns. As this discussion has shown, however, these patterns are not followed quite consistently. For the masses Valentinus might have followed a mere popular meter. This would be the meter that appears in the Septuagint. That which the presence of parallelism and of a smoother style make a possible poem within the Gospel of Truth might have been cast into meters altogether different from that of the Harvest. What poets would not dare to do, namely, to go against the age-long and dignified patterns of classical or at least recognized Hellenistic

---

[1]Berthold Altaner, Patrology (4th ed. rev.; New York: Herder and Herder, 1956), p. 643.

tradition, Valentinus attempted for his middle-class followers. Without literary pretentions he followed the demands of the new form of the language. He was not just writing literature but wrote as a pastor for the people and in the language of the people.

The fact that we do not have a repetition of the meters of the Harvest in the Gospel Poem is not, therefore, a decisive argument against the latter. The prevailing meters, however, are iambic and trochaic and both are Hellenistic. A possible identity of meter between the Harvest and the Gospel Poem on the other hand would not necessarily be a proof that the two poems belong to the same author. A poet can use different meters and the Harvest as reflecting a general Hellenistic meter belongs to a series of similar metrical productions. Not all miures or dactylic tetrameters with a final iamb would be necessarily Valentinian productions. Had we, therefore, a Gospel Poem cast into dactylic tetrameters we still would face the task to prove that these verses belonged to Valentinus' pen. The existence of a Gospel Poem at all and its attribution to Valentinus, therefore, must be established on another foundation.

The basis for the formulation of a theory on the existence of a Gospel Poem is primarily based on the distinction of two styles within the Gospel of Truth, on the philological structure of the isolated parts which taken together exhibit the characteristics of the Gospel type of literature, as we shall see at the appropriate place of this study, and on certain distinctly poetical features. These are: the presence of parallelism of thoughts and concepts which have survived the translation into Coptic, and the fact that

the isolated portions, if retranslated into Greek, constitute a material which exhibits some kind of rhythm and even is susceptible to some kind of accentual metrical elaboration. It is not possible to impose an accentual meter to all kinds of Hellenistic texts. It is not also possible to submit texts to one and the same type of meter. In the case of the Gospel Poem, as we shall see, the same metrical patterns recur over and over again and this persistence is not accidental. The reconstruction that has been attempted here is not the only one possible, especially in matters of detail. There was something, however, that was utterly impossible: the casting of the material into quantitative classical meters, even though occasionally the two metrical patterns coincide. That means that the reconstructed text presents its own limits.

The writer recognizes the hypothetical character of his attempt, especially in connection with the metrical aspect of his reconstruction, he offers, however, the results of his study as a possibility. The correspondence of the Greek text to the Coptic translation from the original is based not only on reliable scholarly translations from the Coptic but also on a word by word checking of the two texts that he attempted with Professor W. W. Isenberg. Whatever its merit might be, therefore, the reconstructed poetical text reflects the text of the Coptic papyrus. The writer offers this text in the following pages with the conviction that it is easier to accept a poetic form for the "text basis" of our homily than a prosaic one.

The Gospel Poem's language can be characterized by the

unquestionably certain use of the very Greek words that the Coptic translator has preserved intact and the possible use of the words that Valentinus has used for his poem.

The recasting of the poetical part of the text into verses will serve as a tentative test for the genuineness and the right position of the words. If the words under certain combinations fit among themselves to form some kind of meter, there is a possibility that they are part of the original language of the text and in their natural position. The debatable point, however, is the character of meter that one expects to find in the poem of Valentinus and the problem of the relationship between the quantitative and the accentual meter in it is of paramount importance to the reconstruction of the Greek meter.

The fact that the words of the poem fit each other is remarkable. It is not possible to make the words of other parts of the Gospel of Truth fit in order to create poetry. Our Gospel Poem can be compared to a temple of the Aswan Dam area in Egypt which is dismantled and its parts lie on the ground not far from each other. They can easily be reintegrated and will easily fit each other. The words of our text are similar to the stone or marble blocks of such a dismantled temple. They were carefully selected by their poet and in spite of their passing through a series of translations they have kept their identity and a relatively short distance from each other. With a little effort they can be rearranged by being removed from the position the rules of the Coptic language and idioms gave them in the present Coptic translation, and by being placed again in their origi-

nal position where they fit each other perfectly. This is exactly what the writer has undertaken in this study.

The writer started with the English text by noticing the presence of parallelism and of two sets of style. Then, the idea came to his mind to reconstruct the Greek original and only in the final stage of his work he thought it necessary to compare the results of his work to Valentinus' poem The Harvest.

Malinines', Grobel's, Schenke's, and Ménard's translations have been used. Especially Ménard's retranslation into ancient Greek has been useful to the writer. He too, occasionally, reproduces poetry without realizing it; as a rule, however, his text is prosaic.

The writer considered it legitimate to transpose, replace, or omit such words as articles, and several uses of the verb εἰμί which are necessary to prose or to the Coptic translation but not to Greek poetry. Certain particles should have been added by the Coptic translator when he converted poetry into prose who, furthermore, definitely dislocated the Greek text in order to make it fit the grammatical and syntactical claims of the Coptic language. This creates a certain amount of freedom for the person who desires to retranslate the Coptic into Greek and above all rediscover the lost rhythm of the original text. In his Greek rendering he must avoid Coptic constructions and idioms.

Occasionally the reconstructed text sounds like the rhythm of the Septuagint text. At other times there is even a syllabic rhythm and even rhyme.

In terms of Erasmian pronunciation the reconstructed text is meaningless. That pronunciation dissolves all kind of rhythm. To a person who is familiar with the Septuagint style and also with modern Greek language, and the hymnology of the Greek Church, it does make sense.

The use of several translations and the transposition of words and sentences make the numerotation of the texts that have been used impossible. Malinine's numerotation, however, is given at the beginning of the periods to orient the reader to find the verses within the text following as a guide the number that shows the first line of a section. For the "lost" pages of the papyrus Grobel's translation has been used.

After these preliminary remarks we are prepared to see those parts of the <u>Gospel of Truth</u> which for their lofty ideas, the feeling of exaltation they include, and their form of expression betray the poetical talent of Valentinus.

Passages which offer the <u>Gospel</u> message seem to be poetical since the content of the Poem is the Gospel itself:

> [Editors--16. 31] The Gospel of Truth is joy
> for those who have received the grace of knowing from the
> Father of Truth Him
> through the power of the Logos come forth
> from the Pleroma
>
> 1 Τό Εὒ αγ/ γέλι ον / τῆς Ἀ λη / θεί ας a
> 2 χα ρά / ἐ στί / τοῖς λα βοῦ / σι χά / ριν b
> 3 πα ρά / τοῦ Πα τρός / τῆς Ἀ / λη θεί / ας a
> 4 ἵν' Αὐ τόν / γνῶ σιν / ἐν τῇ / δυ νά / μει c
> 5 Λό γου /τοῦ ἐλ/ θόν τος / τοῦ Πλη /ρώ μα /τός d

Verse 1 is dactylic tetrameter; verse 2 has feet a,b,d iambic, while

foot c is anapestic; verse 3 has feet a,c,d iambic, while foot b is anapestic; verse 4 starts with a dactyl and is followed by a trochee and two iambs; verse 5 has six trochees. The rhyme sequence is a,b, a,c,d. There is a chiastic schema between χαρά and χάρις of verse 2.

What follows is an elaboration on the Logos which disrupts the poetical form. This diversion ends at p. 17. 1 when the poetical thread is resumed:

> [17. 2] the Gospel is a revelation of Hope,
> since it is a discovery
> for those who seek Him.
>
> 1 Εὐ̄ αγ / γε̄ λῑ / ον
> 2 φα νε̄ / ρω σις / ἐ̄λ πῑ / δος
> 3 τοῖ̄ς αὐ̄ / τὸν ζη̄ / τοῦ̄ σιν
> 4 εὕ̄ ρε̄ / σις

Verses 1, 3, and 4 are trochaic, 1 and 3 trimeter, 4 dimeter. Verse 2 is iambic tetrameter. There is a homonymic parallelism between φανέρωσις of verse 2 and εὕρεσις of verse 4.

Another diversion follows which includes the "error myth" which by no means can be a source of poetical inspiration for the author. The diversion covers 17. 4-18. 11. The Gospel poetry is again resumed with the words: That then, is

> [18. 12] the Gospel of Him
> whom they seek [I omit "and"]
> which He revealed to the Perfect,
> thanks to the clemency [15] of the Father,
> as a hidden Mystery,
> He, Jesus, the Christ.
> Through Him He enlightened
> those who were in darkness
> because of Oblivion.
>
> He enlightened them
> [and] indicated a path [for them];

[20] and that path is the Truth
which He taught them.

1 Τό Εὐ̄ αγ̄ / γέ λῑ ον̄ / τοῦ̄ ζη̄ τοῡ / μέ νοῡ a

2. φᾱ νέ / ρω̄ θέν / τος τοῖς / τε λεί / οις b

3 δῑ ά σπλάγ / χνᾱ ἐ λέ / ους̄ τοῦ̄ / Πᾱ τρός c

4 μω̄ στή / ρῑ όν / ἁ πό / κρῡ φον d

5 δῑ' οὗ̄ / ἔ φώ / τῑ σ''Ι / η̄ σοῦς e

6 Χρῑ στός / τούς ἐν / σκό τεῑ f

7 ὅν τας̄ / δῑ ά / τήν Λή / θην. g

8 'Ε φώ / τῑ σέν / αὐ̄ τούς e

9 ὠ δή / γη̄ σεν / αὐ̄ τούς e

10 ἡ δέ / ὁ δός / 'Α λή / θεῑ ά, h

11 ἥν / ἐ δί / δᾱ ξεν / αὐ̄ τούς e

Verse 1 is dactylic tetrameter; verses 2, 4, and 5 are iambic tetrameter; verse 3 is a combination of two anapestic and two iambic feet; verse 6 has the first foot iambic and the other two trochaic; verse 7 has the first foot trochaic and the remaining three feet iambic; verses 8-10 are all iambic, the first two trimeter while the last two tetrameter. Verses 8, 9, and 11 constitute a rhyme. The rhyme sequence is a,b,c,d,e,f,g,e,e,h, and e. Verses 5 and 7 make an antithetic parallelism; verses 8 and 9 a gradual parallelism; verses 9, 10, and 11 a synthetic one.

[18. 24] It was because of this
that Error became angry with Him,
persecuted Him,
oppressed Him;
annihilated Him.

1 Δι ά / τοῦ το/ ἡ Πλά / νη a
2 ῶρ γί / σθη κάτ' /Αὐ τοῦ, b
3 ἐ δί / ω ξέν / Αὐ τόν, c
4 κα τέ / θλι ψεν / Αὐ τόν c
5 κα τήρ / γη σεν / Αὐ τόν c

Verse 1 has the second foot trochaic, while the rest iambic; it is a tetrameter. The rest of the verses are iambic trimeter. These verses constitute a prosthetic parallelism that culminates in the annihilation of Christ in his physical death. The rush style, and small sentences of the last unit expresses the climax of the feeling of the author when he reaches the crucial point of his poem, the passion of Christ. The rhyme scheme is a,b,a,a,a.

[18. 25] He was nailed to a [cross of] wood
[25] became of Fruit of the knowledge of the Father
which did not, however, bring perdition
upon those who ate it.

On the contrary, those who ate it
He caused to be joyful
because of this discovery.

1 Ξύ λῳ / πρό σῃ /λώ θη a
2 τοῦ / Πα τρός / ἐ γέ / νε τό b
3 τῆς γνώ / σε ὡς / καρ πός c
4 φα γόν / τας δ'οὐκ / ἀ πώ / λε σεν d
5 αὐ τούς / δ'ἐ χά / ρο ποί / η σεν d
6 δι ά / τήν εὔ / ρε σιν e

Verse 1 is trochaic; verses 2-7 are all iambic, 3 and 6 trimeter, while 2, 4, and 5 tetrameter. Between verses 1 and 4 the trimeter and tetrameter patterns alternate every other line. Verses 4-5 make an antithetic parallelism for the opposition of ideas they

include. The rhyme pattern is a,b,c,d,d,e.

[18. 29] As for Him,
He found them in Himself
and they found Him in themselves,
that Incomprehensible [Inconceivable] One,
that perfect Father
who produced the All,
in whom the All is
[35] and whom the All needs.

1 Εὖ ρε̄ / δ'αὐ τοὺς / ἐν Αὐ̄ τῷ̄ , a
2 Αὐ̄ τόν / τ'εὖ ρον̄ / ἐν αὐ̄ / τοῖς , b
3 τόν / ἃ̄ χώ̄ / ρη̄ τόν, c
4 τόν ἃ̄ / κᾱ τά̄ / λη̄ πτόν, c
5 τόν τέ̄ / λεῖ όν / Πᾱ τέ̄ / ρά, d
6 τόν / ποῖ ή̄ / σᾶν τά / τό Πᾶ̃ν, e
7 ἐν ᾧ̄ / ἐσ τί / τό Πᾶ̃ν, e
8 καῖ Οὗ̄ / τό Πᾶ̃ν / ὐ στε̄ / ρεῖ̃. f

Verses 1-2 are trochaic tetrameter with the exception of foot b of verse 1 and foot a of verse 2 which are iambic. Foot c of verse 8 being set apart as trochaic, verses 3-8 are iambic; 3 and 4 and 7 trimeter, while 5, 6 and 8 tetrameter. The meter changes from trochaic to iambic at verse 3 where the poet enumerates attributes of the Father. He usually changes the meter when he is referring to the Father for purposes of emphasis. In these verses we also can notice the presence of prosthetic or synthetic parallelism and in verses 6-8 a gradual parallelism which is repeated in EV 19. 7. The rhyme scheme is a,b,c,c,d,e,e,f.

The theme of the Father is fundamental. Therefore, the feeling of the author arises again and the result is short, rush sentences. A theological discussion on the withheld perfection of the

aeons follows which is a commentary on the "Perfect Father" and the perfection of the aeons. Two verses are introduced in order to remove a possible charge of jealousy against the Father on the retention of the perfection of the aeons.

> [18. 38] Not that He is jealous [namely]
> the Father; what jealousy, indeed, could exist
> between Him and His members?

1 Ὁ / Πᾱ τήρ a
2 οὐ/ φθο̄ νεῖ· a
3 τίς γάρ φθόν/ νος Αὐ τῷ b
4 καί / τοῖς μέ/ λε σιν/ Αὐ τοῦ; b

Each of the verses 1 and 2 includes two iambs; verse 3 has two anapests, while verse 4 has four iambic feet. The rhyme sequence is a,a,b,c.

EV 18. 32-34 is again repeated in EV 19. 7-10 in an almost identical form, the only difference being that in EV 19. 7 the "Perfect Father" is omitted and instead of "is" in the present we have a past tense--"existed." The repetition of these verses with the omission of the subject (the "Perfect Father") is an evidence that they are a quotation from a poem that the author feels free to handle as he likes:

> [19. 7] . . . Him who produced
> the All and in Whom the All
> existed and of whom the All had need.

1 Τόν / ποι ή / σαν τα / τό Πᾶν; a
2 ἐν τῷ / ἐ στι / τό Πᾶν, a
3 καί οὗ / τό Πᾶν / ὑ στε / ρεῖ. b

With the exception of foot c of line 3 these verses are iambic, the first and third tetrameter, while the second trimeter. The rhyme sequence is a,a,b.

A diversion follows on the revelation of the Father, His appearance in the midst of a school as a guide proclaiming the Word, his rejection by the false sages, and finally his acceptance by the children. The children are the Gnostics who have learned to contemplate the aspects of the face of the father (19. 10-32). This contemplation is again expressed in terms of poetry. What is peculiar about it is that it presents a stylistic similarity to the Ode of Solomon 8. 10 based on an interplay between the active and the passive tenses.

[EV 19. 32] The recognized
[and] were recognized.
They were glorified
[and] they glorified.

[OS[1] 8. 10] Guard my mystery
ye who are guarded by it;
Keep my faith,
yet who are kept by it.
And understand my knowledge,
Ye who know me in truth:
Love me with affection,
Ye who love.

The only difference is that the EV uses indirect speech in the Indicative, while the OS uses direct speech in the Imperative.

1 "Έ γνω̄ν / τε̄ καί́ / έ γνώ́ / σθη̄ σά́ν, a
2 έ / δο̄ ξά́ / σθη̄ σά́ν a
3 καί́ / έ δό́ / ξᾱ σά́ν. a

Foot a of line 1 is trochaic, the rest being iambic; verses 2 and 3 are iambic trimeter. The rhyme sequence is a,a,a.

There follows a diversion on the Living book (19. 34), until in 20. 20 we may possibly have another piece of poetry:

[20. 19] The Father of the All . . .
invisible, unique being
existing through Himself,
from whom come forth all spaces.

---

[1] Odes of Solomon hereafter cited as OS.

1 Ἄ ό/ ρᾱ τός/ αὐ τό/ γε νής

2 ἀφ'Οὗ/ πάν τες/ οἱ τό/ ποι.

Both verses are iambic tetrameter; foot b of verse 2 is trochaic.

EV 20. 23-24 follow as a justification of the appearance of Jesus in relation to the Book after what new verses follow:

> [20. 25] He was nailed to a [cross of] wood
> and He attached the deed of disposition of the Father
> to the Cross.
> Oh! great, sublime teaching.
>
> He abases Himself even unto death
> though [30] clothed [already] with immortal life.
> Having divested Himself of these perishable rags,
> He clothed Himself in Incorruptibility,
> which it is impossible for anyone
> to take away from Him.

1 Ξύ/ λῳ/ πρό σῃ/ λῶ θη

2 Πᾱ τρός/ τε τό/ δῑ ά/ ταγ μά

3 πρό ε/ γρᾱ ψε/ σταῦ ρῳ.

4 Ὃ δῑ / δᾱ χῆς / τό με / γε θός

5 Αὐ τόν/ ὡς καί/ θᾱ νά / τοὺ

6 ἐ/ τᾱ πεί/ νῶ σεν/ ὁ ζῶ/ ἣν

7 αἷ ώ / νι ον ἑν / δῦ θείς·

8 ἃ φθάρ/ σί ᾱν/ προ σέ/ λᾱ βεν

9 ρά κῃ/ φθᾱρ τ'ά/ πο βάλ/ λάς,

10 ἣν περ/ οὐκ ἅ/ φαι ρεῖ/ σθαί τις

11 δύ να/ ται ἀπ' / Αὐ τοῦ.

As in EV 18. 25, we again find alternating line lengths. Verse 1 is trochaic trimeter. Verses 2-11 are iambic; lines 3, 7, and 11 trimeter, while lines 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 tetrameter. We meet trochaic verses in feet a of v. 4, c of v. 6, b of v. 8, a of v. 9, a of v. 10, and a of v. 11. Verse 1 differs in meter because the poet wishes to

put emphasis on the cross. While the whole poem is epic, in line 4 we have a lyric element in the fact that the poet cannot conceal his exclamation on the sublime teaching he is describing. The climax of the teaching lies in the doctrine of the humiliation and crucifixion of the Logos but it is questionable whether this is an actual reference to the historical crucifixion or an extension of the Logos on the Horos of the Pleroma. This is a self-sufficient piece of poetry full of antitheses that closes the earthly career of Christ. EV 20. 34 returns to the descent of Christ to earth, the Terror's empty spaces, and his redeeming work among those who were stripped by Oblivion of the Father, always in connection with the Book (EV 20. 34 - 21. 8).

Two verses follow that refer to the perfection of the All (cf. EV 18. 36) and to their need of reascent to the Father:

> [21. 9] [Since] the Perfection of the All is in the Father,
> it is necessary for the All
> to reascend towards him.

1	Ἔ πεί ὅ / ἡ τε / λεῖ ό / της	a
2	τοῦ Πᾶν τός / ἐν Πᾶ τρί,	b
3	ἄ νάγ / κη ἄ / νᾶ βαί / νειν	b
4	Αὐ τῷ / τό Πᾶν / πᾶ λίν.	b

Verse 1 is iambic tetrameter; verse 2 includes two anapestic feet; verse 3 is iambic tetrameter, while verse 4 has two iambs and one final trochaic foot. Verses 2 and 4 have an internal rhyme, while verses 3 and 4 an external one. The rhyme sequence is a,b,c,c.

EV 21. 11 - 22. 13 is a commentary on perfection, a further elaboration on the theme of the Book, on the salvation of the elect

and the destruction of those the names of whom have not been spoken of. The elect are from on high. This is closed by a Valentinian definition of the Gnostic that appears also in the Excerpta of Theodotus (78. 2) in an expanded form:

> [22. 13] He who thus possesses Knowledge,
> knows whence he is come
> and where he is going.
>
> 1 ὁ / γνῶ σό/ με̄ νός a
> 2 σὺ τῳ̄ / γῑ νῶ / σκεί b
> 3 πό θεν̄ / ἧ κεῖ, b
> 4 καῖ ποῖ / δ̄ ποί / χεί . b

Verse 1 has three iambs; in verse 2 the first foot is trochaic and the last two are iambic; verse 3 includes two trochees; verse 4, like v. 1 has three iambs. The rhyme sequence is a,b,b,b.

EV 22. 12 that follows is a commentary on these verses in terms of the simile of intoxication and sobriety. EV 22. 20 - 23. 18 is a discussion on the reascent of the aeons to heaven led by Jesus, the mystery of the aeons, the nature of the Knowledge of the Living Book. The fall of the aeons consists in that they could not understand and know the Father (22. 32), because of his profundity (22. 25). They tried to understand him at a time when His Will had not (yet) become manifest outside Himself (22. 34). This was done by the Logos.

With the omission of EV 24. 3 (but), EV 24. 10^{b}-11^{a} and EV 24. 13-14^{a} all of which are commentaries we reach again a hymn to the Logos which is a continuation of the same hymn in EV 23. 29-32. The new portion of the hymn is EV 23. 34 - 24. 19.

The hymn may be divided into three parts: (1) the Generation of the Logos through the cooperation of all that is in the Father, 23. 19-32; (2) the Procession of the Logos through the All, 23. 33 - 24. 8; and (3) the Revelation of the whole Trinity through the Logos to the aeons bring rest to them, 24. 9-19.

In 23. 19-32 prevails the Semitic poetic form Kina, consisting of short sentences; 24. 1 - 24. 3-6 and 24. 9-12 are prosthetic parallelisms where each sentence completes and furthers the meaning of its precedent.

> [23. 18] His Wisdom meditates on [20] the Logos.
> His Intelligence projects It;
> His Knowledge has been revealed;
> His . . . (?) is like a crown upon It; His
> [20] Joy is mixed with It;
> His Glory It has elevated
> [and] His Image It has revealed.
> His repose [30] It has received within Itself;
> His Love took bodily form around It;
> His Faith encircled It.

1	Ἡ Σō/ φί̄ ā Aὐ̄/ τοῦ̃ με̄ λε̄/ τᾷ̃ τόν / Λό̄γον.	a
2	Ἡ / Φρό̄νη σις / Aὐ̄ τοῦ̃ / Aὐ̄ τόν / λᾱ λεῖ̃.	b
3	Ἡ / γνῶ̃σις / Aὐ̄ τοῦ̃ / ἔ̄ φᾱ νέ̄ / ρω̄ σέν / Aὐ̄ τόν.	a
4	Ὡς /στέ̄ φᾱ νō̄ς / Aὐ̄ τῷ̃ / ἡ̄ τι μή̄ (;) / Aὐ̄ τοῦ̃;	c
5	Ἡ̄ χά ρά̄ / Aὐ̄ τοῦ̃ /σῡ̄γ κε̄ ράν / νῡ̄ τάι / Aὐ̄ τῷ̃.	d
6	Ἡ /δό̄ ξᾱ / Aὐ̄ τοῦ̃ / ὓ̄ περ ὑ̄ /ψω̄ σέν / Aὐ̄ τόν.	a
7	Ἡ̄ εἶ κών / Aὐ̄ τοῦ̃ / ἔ̄ φά /νε̄ ρώ̄ / θη̄ έν / Aὐ̄ τῷ̃.	d
8	Ἡ̄ ἁ̄ νά / παῡ̄ σις / Aὐ̄ τοῦ̃ / ἔ̄ σχε̄ν / Aὐ̄ τόν.	a
9	Ἡ̄ ἁ̄ γά / πη̄ Aὐ̄ τοῦ̃ / σῶ̃ μᾱ / ἔ̄ γέ̄ /νε̄ τό /Aὐ̄ τῷ̃.	d
10	Ἡ / Πί̄ στις σῡ̄ / νέ̄ σχε̄ν Aὐ̄ τόν.	a

After an introductory trochaic foot, verse 1 has two dactyls and two final trochees; verse 2 has a dactyl that is followed by three iambs;

verse 3 is started by a trochaic foot which is followed by an iamb, an anapest and two final iambs which like the preceding iamb have the stress on the last syllable; verse 4 begins with a dactyl which is followed by an iamb, an anapest and a final iamb; verse 5 has two anapests in the first and the third feet, respectively, while the rest is iambic: all feet have the stress on the last syllable; verse 6 is introduced by a trochaic foot and is followed by an iamb, an anapest and two final iambs; verse 7 which is started by an anapest is followed by subsequent iambic feet; in verse 8 the first foot is an anapest which is followed by two iambs, a trochee and a final iamb; verse 9 has two introductory anapests, a trochee and three final iambs; verse 10, finally, concludes the section with two consecutive dactyls and a final defective one.

Verses 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 8 are pentameter; verses 3, 7, and 9 are hexameter, while the concluding verse is only trimeter.

The prevailing meter is the iambic one with occasional trochaic deviations; dactyls and anapests, however, enrich the metrical variety of the poem. The many dactyls echo the dactyls of the Harvest. Here, of course, the dactyls are accentual except in c of v. 1 and a and b of v. 10 which are also quantitative. We should remember, however, that the Harvest has also an accentual dactyl and some others of a dual character. The analogies between the two poems should not be overlooked, as also the final penultimate of verse 1 and the final iambs of the remaining verses.

The rhyme sequence is a,b,a,c,d,a,d,a,d,a.

II

[23. 33] Thus the Logos of the Father
advances [35] in the All
being the Fruit
[24. 1] of His heart
and the expression
of His Will.

But it confirms the All;
It makes a choice
and also takes [upon Itself]
[5] the Form of the All,
purifying It
and causing it to return
to the Father and to the Mother,
Jesus of infinite gentleness.

1	Οὔ τως / Δ Λό/ γος του/ Πα τρός	a
2	δι ή/ κα ι δί/ α του/ Παν τός	a
3	ὧν καρ πός /τῆς καρ δί /ας Αὐ του	b
4	καί μορ φή /του θε λή/ μα τός/ Αὐ του.	b
5	Στη ρί/ ζει τό Πᾶν	c
6	ἐκ λε ξά /με νός /αὐ τό	d
7	καί /του Παν τός	a
8	λαμ βά /νει τήν/ μορ φήν	e
9	κα θαί /ρων αὐ τό	d
10	ἀ να στρέ /φει αὐ τό	d
11	εἰς τόν /Πα τέ/ ρα τήν/ Μη τέ/ ρα	f
12	ἐκ /του ἀ /νε ξί /χνι ά /στου τῆς /γλυ κή /τη τός	a
13	Ἰ η σοῦς	g

Verse 1 is trochaic but the rest is iambic; verse 2 is an iambic tetrameter; verse 3 is made up of three anapests; verse 4 has two anapests and two final iambs; verse 5 has an initial iamb and an anapest; verse 6 has an initial anapest followed by two iambs; verse 7

is a combination of an iamb and an anapest; verse 8 is an iambic trimeter; verse 9 as verses 5 and 7 is a combination of an iamb and an anapest; verse 10 is an anapestic dimeter; verse 11 is an iambic tetrameter; verse 12 includes seven iambs; verse 13 is a single anapest.

The exchange of iambs and anapests with the accent on the last syllable express the swiftness of the procession of the Logos through the Whole.

Lines 5 and 7 have an internal rhyme. The sequence of external rhyme is a,a,b,b,c,d,a,e,d,d,f,a,g.

The whole poem is characterized by a progressive prosthetic parallelism.

III

[24. 9] The Father reveals [10] His Breast . . .
He reveals that of Himself
which was hidden . . .
so that, through [15] the compassion of the Father,
the aeons may know Him
and cease their strivings
in search of the Father
reposing in Him.

1	Ἀ νᾱ κᾱ / λύ πτεῖ τόν / κόλ πον ᾰ / Πᾱ τήρ	a
2	Φᾱ νε ροῖ / τό ᾰ̄ κᾱ / τᾱ́ λῆ πτόν / Αὐ τοῦ	b
3	ἵ νᾱ δῑ / ᾰ́ τοῦ ᾰ̄ / λέ ους τοῦ / Πᾱ τρός	c
4	οἷ αῖ / ῶ νες / γνώ σον / ταί Αὐ / τόν	b
5	καί κό / πῑ ῶν / τες παύ / σον ταί	d
6	τοῦ ζῆ τεῖν / τόν Πᾱ τέ / ρά	e
7	καῖ ᾰ́ / νᾱ παύ / σων ταί / Αὐ τῷ	f
8	γνῶν τες / ὅ τῑ / Αὐ τός	c
9	ῆ ᾰ̄ νά / παυ σίς / αὐ τῶν.	f

Verses 1 and 3 include three dactyls and a final iamb; verse 2 has an anapest, two dactyls and a final iamb; verse 4 has five trochees; verses 5 and 7 are both iambic tetrameter; verse 6 has two anapests; verse 8 has two trochees and a final iamb; verse 9 includes an anapest and two final iambs.

What should be noticed here is the emphasis on the word "Father"; the word itself occurs three times, i.e., verses 1, 3, and 6, while a pronoun referring to it occurs five times, i.e., verses 2, 4, 7, 8, and 9. There is also rhyme between verses 2 and 4 (approximately), 3 and 8, and 7 and 9. There is also a prosthetic parallelism between the lines 4, 5, 6, and 7.

It is noticeable also that verses 5 and 7 are tetrameter, while 6 and 8 are, respectively, either dimeter or trimeter. This creates a case of kina meter in connection to their longer preceding lines. Valentinus could extend the kina meter to non-elegiac material after the manner of Greek elegiac meters. The rhyme sequence is a,b, c,b,d,e,f,c,f.

The dactylic tetrameters and the final iambs recall the meters of the Harvest after they have been transposed, however, to accentual meters.

Preceding the Valentinian Formula of EV 24. 29-33, there is a conspicuous poetical definition of Rest in EV 24. 20-22. It is preceded by an introduction and followed by a comment. The introduction is EV 24. 20: "Repose consists in this." The comment is a clarification of the term "Schema" (verses 22 and 23). The passage on Rest is the following:

[24. 20] Having filled Deficiency
He abolished Form.

1 Πλη̄ ρώ / σᾱς τό / ϑ̄ στέ / ρη̄ μά

2 ā νέ / λῡ̄ σέ / τό σχῆ / μά .

Both verses are iambic tetrameter. These verses, too, can be characterized as kina.

What follows is the short Comment of Form (EV 24. 23-25) and immediately follows EV 25 seqq. which is the definition of Deficiency and Unity in a poetical form:

[24. 25] For the place where there is desire and dissention
is Deficiency,
but the place where there [is] Unity,
is Plenitude.

1 ἐν ᾧ /ζῆ̄ λος /καί ἕ / ρις a

2 ϑ̄ στέ /ρη̄ μά / ἐ στι, b

3 ἐν ᾧ /ϑ'ἐ στιν / ἐ νό / της a

4 τε̄ λεί / ω̄ σίς/ ἐ στι. b

All these verses are iambic trimeter. Here we have a case of antithetic parallelism.

The explanation of the cause of Deficiency follows in a poetical form. This is Jonas' formula on the basis of which he established the Valentinian character of the Gospel of Truth.[1] Formulas were expected to be memorized as summaries of faith and it is not surprising that we meet this one in a poetical form:

[24. 28] Since Deficiency came into existence
because they did know [30] the Father,
so when they know the Father, Deficiency,
at the same instant disappears.

---

[1]Jonas, p. 410.

1	ἐ πε ῑδ' / οὐκ ἔ / γί γνω̄ / σκόν	a
2	τόν Πᾱ / τέ ρᾱ	b
3	ῡ̄ στέ / ρη̄ μά / ἔ γέ / νε τό	c
4	εἰ / γῑγ νώ / σκοῡ σι	a
5	τόν Πᾱ / τέ ρᾱ	b
6	τό τε̄ / οὐχ ῡ̄ / στέ ρη̄ / μά	c

These verses are a combination of trochaic and iambic. Verses 1, 2, 5, and 6 are trochaic: verses 1 and 6 are tetrameter, while verses 2 and 5 are dimeter. Verses 3 and 4 are iambic: verse 3 is tetrameter, while verse 4 is trimeter. There is a rhyme between lines 2 and 5. There is internal rhyme between lines 3 and 6, while there is a rhyme of thought between 1 and 4. There is also an antithetical parallelism here. The rhyme sequence is a,b,c,a,b,c.

A commentary follows that explains the Formula, a discussion on Unity as contrasted to diversity, and a note on the end of the world and on the abolition of matter (EV 24. 33 - 25. 19).

EV 25. 23-25 is also a quotation from a poetical source:

[25. 23] that the House be holy
[and] silent
for unity.

1	Τό οἰ / κη̄ τή / ρι ον
2	ἁ / γι ά / ζε̄ ται
3	καί ή / σῡ χά / ζεί
4	εἰς τήν / ἔ νό / τη̄ τά

These verses are all iambic trimeter.

There follows a section on the judgment on the World (EV 25. 35 - 27. 9] which may be poetical in its main body and independent

from the Gospel of Truth. The theme is introduced by a prosaic discussion about people moving to another neighborhood who broke unsound jars. The parable is applied to the Judgment which has come from on high through the appearance of the Logos and all of a sudden we are informed that "When the Logos appeared . . . a great confusion reigned among the jars" (26. 4-10). This serves as an introduction to the section which is closed by a significant conclusion: "this is the manifestation of the Father and His Revelation to His aeons" (EV 27. 5), after which follows a prosaic commentary on that revelation. What lies between is a poetical formulation of doctrine concerning the revelation and judgment through the manifestation of the Logos:

[26. 4] When the Logos appeared . . .
[26. 8] a great confusion reigned among [10] the jars,
for some had been emptied,
others filled;
some were provided for,
others were overthrown;
some were sanctified,
still others [15] were broken to pieces.

All the spaces were shaken and confused,
for they had no fixity
nor stability.

Error was agitated,
not knowing [20] knowing what It should do.
It was afflicted,
and lamented
[and] worried
because It knew nothing.

1 Τοῦ Λό/ γοῡ φᾱ νέν /τος a

2 με̄ γά/ λη̄ ε̄́ γέ /νε̄ τό b

3 στά́ σις/ ἔν τοῖ̄ς/ σκεύ ε̄ /σιν· c

4 τᾱ́ μέν/ ἔ κε̄ / νώ· θη̄, d

5 τᾱ́ δέ /ἔ πλη̄ /ρώ́ θη̄, d

6	ἀλλ'ἐ / χό ρη / γή θη,	d
7	ἄλ λα / δ'ἐ ξε / χύ θη,	d
8	ἄλ λα/ δ'ἡ γι / ά σθη,	d
9	ἐ θραύ / σθη δέ ἄλ / λα,	e
10	πάν / τες οἳ τό / ποι	f
11	ἐ σα / λεύ θη / σάν,	g
12	ἐ τα / ρά χθη / σάν,	g
13	οὐ γάρ / βε βαι / ό της / ἦν	h
14	ἐν αὐ τοῖς,	j
15	οὔ τε / στά σις.	k
16	Ἡ πό / ρει ἡ Πλά / νη,	d
17	ἡ γνό / ει δ'ὅ/ τι πρά / ξει,	d
18	ἐ λυ / πή θη,	d
19	ἐ θρή / νη σέν,	l
20	ἐ θαμ/ βώ θη,	d
21	γι νώ / σκου σα / οὐ δέν.	l

These fast and vigorous verses with so many "asyndeta" are appropriate to the theme of confusion that was brought about among the vessels on the appearance of the Logos.

Verses 1, 9, 10, and 16 are composed, as many verses are, of an iamb and an anapest; verse 2 has a middle anapest preceded and followed by an iamb; verses 3 and 13 have four trochees; verses 4 and 5 have an iamb followed by two trochees; verses 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 are iambic trimeter; verse 14 has a single anapest; verses 15, 18, and 20 are trochaic dimeter; verses 17 and 21 are iambic trimeter; verse 19 is an iambic dimeter. Verses 18 to 21 are an interchange of trochaic and iambic, showing the climax of the embarrassment of Error,

while verse 21 with its iambic ending puts an end to the theme of the confusiong of the vessels.

The rhyme sequence is a,b,c,d,d,d,d,d,e,f,g,g,h,j,k,d,d,d,l, d,l. There is internal rhyme in lines 8 and 9. There is also a prosthetic parallelism between verses 4-9, 10-12, and 18-20. As a true elegy expressing a dirge the kina meter is prevailing in lines 13 and 14, and 17 and 18-21.

EV 26. 23^{b}-27 I consider a short comment on Error, Ignorance, and the word "Emanations" of 26. 25, an anticipation of its repetition in 26. 29.

> [26. 28] Truth appeared;
> all its Emanations [?] recognized It.
>
> [26. 30] They saluted the Father in truth
> with a perfect force,
> reunited, as they were, by It, to the Father.

1	ἔ φά̀ / νη ή́ / Ἀ λή́/ θει ά̀,	a
2	ἔ́ / γνω̄ σά̀ν / Αὐ̄ τή́ν	b
3	αἴ πρό̀ / βο̄ λαί́/ Αὐ̄ τῆ̃ς,	b
4	ή̄ σπά̀ / σᾱν τό̀ / τό́ν Πᾱ / τέ́ ρᾱ	c
5	ἔν / Ἄ λη̄ / θεί́ ᾱ ,	c
6	ἔ́ν δῡ νά̀ / μεῑ τε̄ λεί́/ ᾳ	a
7	σῡγ κέ̀ / ρᾱν νύ́ / σαῑ τῷ́ / Πᾱ τρί́	d

Verses 1 and 7 are iambic tetrameter; verses 2 and 3 are iambic trimeter; verse 4 is a combination of two iambs and two trochees; verse 5 has two trochees; verse 6 has two anapests. The rhyme sequence is a,b,b,c,c,a,d. There is a prosthetic parallelism in these verses.

EV 26. 33 is a commentary that serves as a link between the

salutations of the aeons and the following Trinitarian formula the background of which is kissing and salutation, a common Valentinian theme, or the machinery of speech.

> [26. 34] Truth is the Mouth of the Father;
> His Tongue is the Holy Ghost.
>
> 1 Στό μᾱ / τοῦ Πᾱ / τρός
> 2 ἡ Ἀ / λή θεῖ / ά,
> 3 γλῶσ σᾱ / δὲ Ἁῡ / τοῦ
> 4 Πνεῦ μᾱ / Ἅ γι / ον.

All verses are trochaic trimeter.

In this formula we have Father, Truth, and Holy Ghost. Truth is another name for the Son.

The formula is interwoven with the details of the kissing which may be related with the liturgy of the Nuptial Chamber. The emphasis is placed on tongue and mouth.

The Gnostic is attached to the mouth of the Father by the latter's Tongue. How? The ceremonial aspect of this kissing is secondary. What is of primary importance is a parallel in the Odes of Solomon (OS xxviii. 1):

> As the wings of doves over their nestlings,
> And the mouths of their nestlings towards their mouths;
> So also are the wings of the Spirit over my heart.

The mouths of the nestlings are turned towards the mouths of their parents for food. The same Ode speaks of embrace and kiss:

> [OS xxviii. 6] And deathless life embraced me
> and kissed me
> [7] and from that life is the Spirit within me.

The Valentinian application of the Ode is conspicuous. The appearance of the Truth brought knowledge to the aeons who were re-

united to the Father. The kiss of reunion is the communication of the Logos, which brings eternal life. The movement of the tongue results to the utterance of the Word, which is feeding the Gnostic and abiding in him in a Johannine manner (EV 27. 13). The basis of the simile is the way birds are feeding their nestlings. This is a mouth-to-mouth communication comparable to a kiss. The Word is at the same time sound and food. The ceremony of receiving the Holy Ghost through a mouth-to-mouth kiss may be related to Baptism and the Nuptial Chamber sacrament.[1]

After the comment on the salutation and on receiving the Holy Ghost through kissing (26. 34 - 27. 4) follows a long section (EV 27. 7 - 30. 12) on the Father confering form and name to the aeons, and on the illusionary character of life expressed by a Nightmare. Possily 28. 26-28 is a quotation from an unknown Valentinian poem:

[28. 26] I am
as the shadows and the phantoms of the Night.

1 Ὡσ περ / αἱ σκι / αἱ ε / γω

2 καὶ φάν / τα σί / αι τῆς / νυκ τός.

Verse 1 is trochaic tetrameter, while verse 2 is iambic tetrameter. This is a synonymic parallelism.

This can be supported by the change of the person from the first into the third and by the following commentary.

EV 30. 13-21 is a triumphant praise of the man who awoke from sleep moulded upon Sapiential Psalm I:

[30. 13] Joy to the man
who has rediscovered himself
and has awakened!
And [15] blessed is He
who has opened the eyes of the blind!

---

[1] Cf. EV 27. 13 on the Valentinians as children.

And the Spirit came to him in haste
when It resuscitated him.
Having helped [20] him
who was stretched out upon the ground,
it placed him upon his feet,
for truly he had not yet reappeared.

1 Ἀ / γᾱ θός / ἔ στι a
2 ὅς ἐ / πῑ στρέ / φει a
3 καί / ἐ γεί / ρᾱ ται, b
4 καί / μᾱ κά / ρι ος c
5 ὃ δι / ᾱ νοί / ξας d
6 τῡ φλῶν / ὀ φθαλ μούς. e
7 καί τό / Πνεῦ μᾱ / ἔ σπευ / σέν f
8 αὐ τόν / τοῦ ἐ γεί/ρειν g
9 ἐκ τεῖ / ναν τὴν χεῖ / ρά h
10 χᾱ μαί / τῷ ἐ / πί γῆς. i
11 ἐ / πί τῶν / πο δῶν / αὐ τοῦ j
12 ἐ στή /ρι ξεν / αὐ τόν, k
13 οὐ γάρ / ὀ'ἐ γη / γερ κεν / πω. l

Verses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, and 12 are all iambic trimeters; verse 6 is a combination of a single iamb and an anapest; verses 7 and 13 are trochaic tetrameters; verses 8 and 9 have a middle anapest between an initial and a final iamb. There is a rhyme between verses 1 and 2. There is also a synonymic parallelism between verses 1 and 4, and 2 and 3.

EV 30. 24-26 is a poetical introduction to another segment of the Logos Hymn. The Logos gave the Gnostics the Knowledge of the Father and the Revelation of the Son:

[30. 24] The Gnosis of the Father
and the revelation [25] of His Son,
these gave them the possibility of knowing.

1 Τ̄ήν γνῶ / σιν τοῦ / Πᾱ τρός a

2 φᾱ νέ / ρω̄ σίν / ὁ Ῡῑ οὗ / Αὐ̄ τοῦ b

3 γνῶ ναι / ε̄ πέ / τρε̄ ψεν / αὐ̄ τούς b

Verse 1 is an iambic trimeter; verse 2 is an iambic tetrameter; verse 3 is a combination of a trochee and three iambs. Verses 1 and 2 make a prosthetic parallelism. The rhyme sequence is a,b,b.

EV 30. 27-31. 4a follows as an amplification of the Revelation of the Beloved Son that the material man has rejected (EV 31. 1) before the Logos Hymn continues:

[31. 4] He came
in a similitude of Flesh,
although nothing could obstruct Its course,
because It was incorruptible
and uncoercable.

Moreover, pronouncing [10] new things,
saying that which is in the heart of the Father,
He proclaimed the Word
which is without flaw.

Light spoke through His mouth,
[15] and His voice
engendered Life.

1 Ἦλ θεν / ὁ μοι / ο̄ τη̄ τός / σαρ κός a

2 γίγ νο / μέ νου / ε̄μ πο δών / οὐ δε̄ νός a

3 αὐ τῆς / τῇ ἐκ / πλη̄ ρώ / σει, b

4 ὅ τι / ἃ φθαρ σί / ά c

5 καί ἃ κα / τᾱ λη̄ ψί / ά c

6 ἣν / ἐν αὐ τῇ b

7 και νά / τε̄ ἀγ γέλ / λων d

8 ἐ τι / δέ κη ρύτ / των d

9	Πᾱ τρός / τᾱ́ ἐν / καρ δί / ᾴ	c
10	προ ῆ́ / νεγ κε Λό / γόν	d
11	τόν τέ / λεῑ́ όν.	d
12	Αὔ τοῦ / δῑ ά́ / τοῦ στό / μᾱ τος	a
13	ἔ λᾱ́ / λῃ σέ / τό φῶς,	a
14	καί / ῆ́ φω νή / Αὔ τοῦ	e
15	ἔ τε κε / τήν ζω ήν.	f

Verse 1 has the third foot anapestic preceded by two trochees and followed by a final iamb; verse 2 has again the third foot anapestic preceded by two trochees but followed by a final anapest; verses 3, 9, and 12 are iambic tetrameter; verses 4 and 8 have a middle anapest located between a trochee and an iamb; verse 5 is a combination of a dactyl, an anapest and an iamb; verse 6 has two anapests; verses 7, 10, and 14 have a middle anapest between two iambs; verse 11 is iambic dimeter; verse 13 is iambic trimeter, while verse 15 is a combination of a dactyle and a final anapest. The prevalence of the anapestic and iambic meters make the verses vigorous, while the change of meters refreshes the mind of the reader. The rhyme pattern is a,a,b,c,c,b,d,c,d,d,a,a,e, and f. A prosthetic parallelism controls the poem.

[31. 16] He gave them thought and intelligence
and mercy and salvation
and the Spirit of Strength,
coming from the Infinite [20] of the Father,
and [from] gentleness.

1	Ἔν νοι / άν καῑ́ / σύ νε / σίν	a
2	ἔ δω / κεν αὔ / τοῖς,	b
3	σώ τη / ρί́ αν / ἔ λε / ος	c

4 Πνεῦ μᾱ / τε δύ / νά με / ὡς c
5 ἐκ τοῦ / ἀ νε / ξί χνι / ά στου d
6 τῆς /κλῡ κύ / τη τός c
7 τοῦ / Πᾱ τρός . c

Verses 1, 3, 4, and 5 are trochaic tetrameter; verse 2 is trochaic trimeter; verse 6 is iambic trimeter, while verse 7 is iambic dimeter. The rhyme sequence is a,b,c,c,d,c,c. Prosthetic parallelism prevails here also.

[31. 21] He caused punishments and tortures to cease--
for it was they
which caused many persons
in need of mercy to wander far from His Face
[25] in Error and chains--
and, by force, He destroyed them
and confounded them with Knowledge.

He became a Way
for those who erred,
[30] and Knowledge
for those who were ignorant;
a Discovery
for those who sought
and a Confirmation
for those who vacillated;
an immaculate Innocence
for those who [31] were defiled.

1 κο λά / σεις καί μά / στι γάς a
2 προ σώ / που τοῦ / Αὐ τοῦ b
3 ὅ τι / πολ λούς / ἐ πλά / νων c
4 κα τέ / παυ σέν / αὐ τάς, a
5 οἵ ἐν / δεσ μοῖς / καί Πλά / νη d
6 ἐ λέ / ους ὑ / στε ροῦ / σί, d
7 κα τέ / λυ σέ / δυ νά / μει d
8 καί δι / ά γνώ / σε ως e
9 κα τή / σχυ νέν / αὐ τούς. f

10	’Ē / γέ νε τō/ ὅ θεν	g
11	ὁ ὁός / τοῖς πλά / νῶ μέ / νοις,	h
12	γνῶ σις / τοῖς ἁ / γνō οὖ / σιν,	d
13	σὺ ρē / μā τοῖς / ζē τοῦ / σι,	d
14	κρά τος / τοῖς ἁ / στα τοῦ / σιν,	d
15	κά θαρ σις	h
16	τοῖς / με μι / ā σμέ / νοις	h

Verse 1 has a middle anapest between two iambs; verses 2, 4, 8, and 9 are iambic trimeter; verses 3, 5, 12, 13, and 14 have a trochee and three iambs; verses 6, 7, 11, and 16 are iambic tetrameter; verse 10 has a dactyl and a trochee while verse 15 is a single dactyl. The rhyme sequence is a,b,c,a,d,d,d,e,f,g,h,d,d,d,h,h. Prosthetic parallelism controls these verses and particularly between verses 3, 5, and 6; 4, 7, and 9; and 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

The parable of the lost sheep follows (EV 31. 35 - 32. 16), which serves as a commentary both to the material man of 31. 1 represented by the ninety-nine lambs, and to the one sheep, represented by those who erred and found their way of 31. 29. EV 32. 17-37 refers to the lamb which fell into a pit, the continuation of the work of salvation on the Sabbath and the Day from on High. What follows is a hymn-like praise of the Gnostics that I reproduce here in Grobel's translation, since the Edition Princeps omits pages 33-36 which were missing from the Jung Codex and were later found by Söderbergh. For the missing pages I am following Grobel's translation.

> [32. 32] You are that perfect Day,
> in you dwells
> the Light which is not wont to cease.

[32. 35] Speak about the Truth
with those who seek her,
and about Gnosis
with those who have sinned in their error.

[33. 1] Strengthen the feet of those
who have slipped,
and stretch out your hand
to those who are sick,
feed those who are hungry,
and those who are weary,
[33. 5] give them rest.

Raise those who wish to rise.
Wake those
who sleep.
For you are that understanding that rescues.

If [33. 10] strength so acts,
it is wont to become stronger still.

Pay heed to yourselves;
do not pay heed to other things,
the things
which you have cast out of yourselves,
which you have [33. 15] left behind.

Do not buy them back
to submit to them.
Be not moth-eaten,
be not worm-eaten,
for you have already cast it out.

Be not to yourselves a
[33. 20] place for the devil,
for you have already brought him to nought.

1	Ϯ μεῖς / ε̄ στέ / ⳏ τε λεί / ā ⳏ μέ / ρά	a
2	ἐν / ϑ̄ μῖν / οῖ κεῖ	b
3	τό ⲇ̄ νέ / σπε̄ ρο̄ν φῶς.	c
4	Ἀ̄ λή / θεῑ ἀν / λᾱ λή / σᾱ τε	d
5	τοῖς / αϑ̄ τήν / ζη̄ τοῦ / σιν	e
6	καί γνῶ / σιν ⲇ̄ / μᾱρ τά / νοῡ σι	e
7	ἐν Πλά / νη τῇ / αϑ̄ τῶν.	f

In verse 1 the first two feet are iambic, while the last three are anapestic' verse 3 is anapestic dimeter; verses 2 and 7 are iambic trimeter; verses 4 and 6 are iambic tetrameter. The rhyme sequence is a,b,c,d,e,e,f. There is a synonymic parallelism in lines 1, and 2-3, and in lines 4 and 6.

1	τόν πό / δᾱ στῃ ρί / ζε τε	a
2	ῡ̄ πο / σκε̄ λῑ σθέν / τών,	b
3	χεῖ ρᾱς / τ'ῡ̄ μῶν / ἐκ τεί / νε̄ τε	a
4	ἐ̄ πί / τοῖς ἀ / σθε̄ νοῦ / σι,	c
5	πε̄ νῶν / τᾱς ἐκ τρέ / φε̄ τε,	a
6	κο̄ πῑ ῶν / τᾱς ἀ νά / παύ ε̄ τε,	a
7	ἆρ θῇ / ναι τούς θε / λον τάς / ἀ νί / στᾱ σθε,	d
8	ἐ̄ γεί / ρε̄ τε / ῡ̄ πνοῦν / τάς.	e
9	Ἦ / σύ νε̄ σις / ἔλ κοῡ σᾱ	f
10	ῡ̄ μεῖς / γᾶρ ἐ̄ στέ.	a
11	Εἶ σύ / τως ἔ / χει ἡ / ἶ σχύς,	g
12	ἶ σχυ / ρο̄ τέ / ρᾱ γίγ / νε̄ ται.	a
13	Ἔ αῡ τοῖς / προ̄ σέ / χε̄ τέ,	a
14	μή ἆλ λο̄ / τρί οις,	g
15	ἄ ἀφ' / ῡ̄ μῶν / ἀ πέ / θε̄ τε,	a
16	ἄ τῑ νᾱ / ἐ ξε̄ βάλ / λε̄ τε,	a
17	μή αὖ τοῖς / ἐ πῑ στρέ / φε̄ τε	a
18	εἶς τό / αὖ τά / φᾱ γεῖν.	h
19	Ση̄ ό / βρο̄ τοι / μή γίγ / νε̄ σθε,	d
20	μη̄ δέ / σκω̄ λη̄ κό / βρο̄ τοι,	i
21	ὅ τῑ / ἀ πε / τῑ νά/ ξᾱ τε	a
22	ἥ δη̄ / αὖ τά.	f

23	Δι ᾱβό / λοῡ τό / πος μή / ἔ στέ	a
24	ὅ τῑ / κά τηρ / γή σᾱ / τε	a
25	ἥ δη̄ / αὖ τόν.	j
26	Μή σκάν / δᾱ λά / στη̄ ρί / ζε̄ τε	a
27	ὓ μῶν / τᾱ́ κά / τᾱ πί / πτον τα	f
28	ὡς ἔ / λεγ χός / ἔ στίν.	h

This is a didactic poem cast in a monotonous predominant iambic meter with occasional changes into anapests, trochees, and dactyls. As it is, it reminds one of a school atmosphere and the authoritative style of a teacher. In verses 1, 2, 5, and 20 we have a middle anapest preceded and followed by an iamb; verses 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 19, 23, 26, and 27 have iambic tetrameters; verse 6 combines two anapests with a final dactyl; verse 7 has feet a, c, d, and e iambic and foot b anapestic; verses 9 and 14 have two dactyls; verse 10 has an iamb and an anapest; verse 13 has an anapest followed by two iambs; verses 15 and 21 combine a trochee with three iambs; verses 16 and 17 combine a dactyl with an anapest and a final iamb; verses 18 and 28 are iambic trimeter; verses 22 and 25 are combinations of a trochee and an iamb, while verse 24 is trochaic tetrameter. The rhyme pattern is a,b,a,c,a,a,d,e,f,a,g,a,a,g,a,a,a, h,d,i,a,f,a,a,j,a,f, and h.

Prosthetic parallelism occurs in lines 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9. Synonymic parallelism in lines 15, 16; 19, 20; 21, 24 and 27. Antithetic parallelism in lines 13 and 14; 15 and 17; 24 and 25. Kina meter occurs in lines 9 and 10 and in 17 and 18.

This parainesis is the practical application of the preceding Logos hymn, where mention is made of those who sleep, err, vacillate and need awakening, knowledge and confirmation. The Gnostics, as logoi, must further the work of the Logos.

A comment on the Devil follows and on the violation of the law. EV 33. 22-30 and the parainetic section that follows are moulded on Mathew's style in the Sermon on the Mount. They include commendements and prohibitions and the whole thing is terminated by a conclusion that reminds Mt. 5:48:

> [33. 30] Do you therefore the will of the Father,
> for you are from Him.
> For the Father is kind
> and His will is that which is good.

There follows a long meditation on the Aroma of the Father, on lapse into apostasy and restoration, on cold and hot Aroma (EV 33. 1 - 36. 16). EV 34. 28 - 35. 2 is another poetic section that the author incorporates into his text with the introductory words "this is why God came" (EV 34. 28).

> [34. 28] This is why God came:
> He abolished the separation
> [34. 30] and brought the Pleroma
> which is hot with love,
> in order that the coldness
> be no more.
> But the Reunion is due to the perfect Thought;
> this [34. 35] is the Logos of the Gospel
> of the finding of the Pleroma
> by those who stretch out
> toward [35. 1] the salvation
> which comes from above.

1	Θε̄ ός̀ / πρὸς τοῦ̀ / το̄ ῆ̀γ / γῑ κὲν	a
2	τό̀ν με̄ / ρῑ σμό̀ν / κᾱ τὲ / λῡ̄ σέν,	a
3	τό̀ Πλή̀ / ρω̄ μά̀ / τε̄ ή̀ / νε̄γ κὲν	a

4	ā ga / pīs to / θēr mon,	b
5	i na / mē eis / to gig / nē sθai	c
6	to psu / χōs a / na stre / phē,	d
7	ēn noi / as te / to te / leī on	b
8	al l'ē / ē no / tīs ē.	d
9	Tou / Eu ag / gē li / ou	•
10	ou tos / ē stin / a lo / gos.	f
11	Plē rō / mā tos / eu re / sē ōs	f
12	toīs a / nō θen / ēn tei / nou sin	g
13	ē kou / sān sō / tē ri / an.	h

Verses 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, and 12 are iambic tetrameter; verses 2, 10, and 13 each combine a trochee to three iambs; verses 4 and 8 are iambic trimeter; verse 5 is a combination of two trochees and two iambs. The rhyme scheme is a,a,a,b,c,d,b,d,e,f,f,g,h. The kina meter is found in lines 3 and 4, and 7 and 8.

Prosthetic parallelism is found in lines 1 through 4 and, again, in lines 9 to 10 as against 11 to 13. Antithetic parallelism is found in lines 1 through 4 as against 5 and 6. Synonymic parallelism is found in lines 2 and 8.

A comment follows on "stretching out" and on Deficiency and the Pleroma.

Section 36. 17 - 37. 1 deals with the anointment by Christ, and the refilling of the leaking jars. EV 36. 34 - 36. 37 is another example of incorporated poetry followed by a commentary on Paradise:

> [36. 35] The Father is perfect.
> He is good.
> He knows his plantings,
> for it is He

who planted them
in His Paradise.
His Paradise
is His place of rest.

1	Ὁ / Πᾱ πήρ / ὃ τέ/ λεῖ ος	a
2	ἅ / γᾱ θός/ ἐ στίν,	b
3	γῖγ νώ / σκεῖ τᾱ́ σπέρ / μᾱ τα	c
4	Αὗ τός / γᾱ́ρ ἐ στί,	b
5	ὁ / ταῦ τᾱ / σπεί ρᾱς	d
6	Αὗ τοῦ / τῷ Πα / ρᾱ δεί / σῴ,	e
7	ὃ δέ / Πᾱ ρά / δεῖ σός / Αὗ τοῦ	f
8	τό πος / Αὗ τοῦ	f
9	τῆς ἅ / νᾱ παύ / σε ὡς / ἐ στίν.	b

Verses 1, 6, 7, and 9 are iambic tetrameter; verse 2 is iambic trimeter; verse 3 is a combination of an anapest and two iambs, one initial and one final; verse 4 is a combination of an initial iamb and an anapest; verse 5 is trochaic dimeter; verse 8 combines one trochee and an iamb. Kina meter occurs in verse 1 and 2, 3 and 4, and 7 and 8. The rhyme scheme is a,b,c,b,d,e,f,f,b.

This piece of poetry is paralleled by OS xi. 16 seq. The Paradise is the Pleroma itself.

Four themes follow, introduced by EV 37. 1-3: "This is completion by the thought of the Father, and these are the words of his meditation." The themes are The Logos and the origin of the aeons (37. 4 - 37. 20), the Will of the Father (37. 21 - 38. 7), a second meditation on the Name (38. 8 - 40. 29), and finally the Place (40. 30 - 43. 23).

Of these, the theme on the Place is in a poetical form and

might be called "The Place Poem." It concerns the Pleroma and it can be considered the holiest subject of meditation of a Valentinian, after the Father and the Logos. EV 40. 30 - 41. 12 serves as a reviewing introduction:

(Editors.) [41. 13] His [Christ's] own place of repose
is his Pleroma.
[For this reason], all the [41. 15] beings
which have emanated [?] from the Father
are Pleromas
and all the beings
which have emanated [?] from Him
have their roots
in Him
who caused them all to grow
in Himself.

He appointed [41.20] their destinies;
they, then, became manifest individually,
in order that they . . .
by their own thought.
For the place
to which they extend their thoughts
[25] that place is their root,
which lifts them up
through all heights,
even unto the Father.

They reach His Head
which is repose for them,
[30] and they remain there,
close to Him,
in such a way that
they have participated in His Face
through embraces.

[35] On the other hand,
they were not revealed
[42.1] in such a way
that they did not, themselves, elevate themselves.

Neither have they been deprived
of the Glory of the Father
nor have they thought of Him
[5] as being small, or hard, or irascible,
but [rather] as being absolutely good, unshakable, mild
knowing all the spaces
even before
they have come into existence,
and [10] having no need of instruction.

This is the manner of existence
of those who have something
from on high,
near that immeasurable Greatness,
while they [15] strain
towards that unique One
who is perfect
and who is there
for their sakes.

And they do not descend into Hades.

They experience
neither desire nor [20] lamentation;
no more is there Death in them.

But it is in Him who is in repose
that they repose,
without striving
nor becoming entangled
in the search [25] for Truth.

[But] they are themselves Truth;
and the Father is in them,
and they are in the Father,
being perfect
[and] inseparable from [30] that truly good [Being].

They lack nothing in any way;
but they repose,
refreshed by the Spirit.

And they perceive their root,
[and] they devote themselves to themselves, [namely]
[35] those in whom He will find His Root
[and in Whom He] will suffer no detriment
to [His] soul.

Such is the place of the Blessed;
such is their place.

1	Τό̀ πος̄ / ά̀ νᾱ / παύ̀ σε̄ / ὡς Αὐ̄ / τοῦ̀	a
2	ε̄́ στί̀ / τό̀ Πλή̀ / ρω̄ μά̀ / Αὐ̄ τοῦ̀.	a
3	Τοῦ̀ / Πᾱ τρός̀ / αἳ πρό̀ / βο̄ λαί̀	b
4	πλη̄ ρώ̀ / μᾱ τά̀ / εἳ σί̀,	c
5	τή̀ν ρί̀ / ζαν̄ αὐ̄ τῶν̀ / ἔ̀ χοῡ σιν̄	d
6	ἐν̄ τῷ̀ / αὐ̄ ξή̀ / σαν̄ τὶ.	e

7	Τόν / ὅ ρον / αὖ τῶν	f
8	ἐ / δω̄ κέν / αὖ τοῖς	g
9	ἐ καστ' / ἐ φά / νε ρώ / θη σάν	h
10	ἐν νοί / ᾳ τῇ / αὖ τῶν.	f
11	Ἐν θα γάρ / ἀ πο στέλ / λου σί	d
12	ἐν νοι ἂν / τήν αὖ τῶν	f
13	ρί ζα / ἀ νά / γου σά / ἐ στίν	i
14	αὖ τῶν / ἐν ὑ / ψη λοῖς	g
15	αὖ τάς / πρός τόν / Πα τέ / ρα	j
16	ἐ ως / τῆς κέ / φα λῆς / Αὖ τοῦ	a
17	ἐν θα / ἀ νά / παυ σίς / αὖ τῶν.	f
18	Αὖ/τῆς τε ἀν/ τέ χον ται	b
19	προ η κυΐ / αι αὖ τοῦ	a
20	ὅ τι / ἐν ἀ / σπασ μοῖς	g
21	προ σώ / που τοῦ / Αὖ τοῦ	a
22	ἡ μέ / θε ξίς / αὖ τῶν.	f

Verse 1 is a trochaic pentameter; verses 2, 3, and 15 are iambic pentameter; verses 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 21, and 22 are iambic trimeter; verse 5 has an initial iamb, an anapest, and a final dactyl; verse 7 has a middle trochee between two iambs; verses 9, 13, 16, and 17 are combinations of one trochee and three iambs; verse 11 has an initial dactyl followed by an anapest and an iamb; verse 12 has a dactyl and an anapest; verse 18 is trochaic trimeter; verse 19 has two anapests and verse 20 has a trochee and two iambs. The rhyme sequence is a,a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,f,d,f,i,g,j,a,f,b,a,g,a, and f.

There is a prosthetic parallelism in verses 3 and 4, and 5

and 6; an internal rhyme in verses 5 and 13; an internal prosthetic parallelism in verses 16 and 17, and in 20 to 22.

1	Οὐ δε / ἐ φά / νε ρω / θη σάν	a
2	οὐ / ρα νό / βα του / σαι,	b
3	οὔ τε / ὐ στέ / ρη σάν	a
4	τῆς δό / ξης τοῦ / Πα τρός,	c
5	οὔ τε / Αὐ τόν / νο μί / ζου σι	d
6	ὡς μι κρόν, / οὔ τε / πι κρόν, / οὔτ'ὄρ γίλ / λον	e
7	ἄλλ'ἄ / κα κόν, / ἄ τά / ρα χόν / γλυ κύν	f
8	γιγ νώ / σκον τ'ἄ / παν ταις τό / πους	g
9	πρίν αὐ τούς / γεν νη θῆ / ναι,	h
10	οὐδ'ὅ / τι χρεί / αν ἔ / χον τά	i
11	δι δᾶ / σκε σθαι / Αὐ τόν.	e

Verses 1, 2, and 10 are iambic tetrameter; verse 3 combines a trochee to two iambs; verses 4 and 11 are iambic trimeter; verse 5 has an initial trochee and three iambs; verse 6 has an initial anapest, a trochee, an iamb, an anapest, and a final iamb; verse 7 is iambic pentameter; verse 8 has two initial iambs, a middle anapest and a final iamb; verse 9 has two anapests and a final iamb. The rhyme sequence is a,b,a,c,d,e,f,g,h,i,e.

Antithetical parallelism is found in lines 1 and 2, and 3 and 4; it is also found in verses 5 and 6 as against verses 7 and 11.

12 Θῦ τως / ἐ χου / σιν

13 οἱ ἄ / νω θέν / τι ἔ / χον τες

14 πα ρά / του Με / γε θους

15 τοῦ / ἀ με / τρη του

16 τεί́ νόν / τές εῖς / τοῦ́ τō / τό́ μό́ / νον ἔ́ν

17 καῖ́ τέ́ / λεῖ ό́ν / αὖ τοῖ́ς,

18 ὅ́ / ἓ στί́ν / ἓ κεῖ́.

Verse 12 is trochaic trimeter; verse 13 is iambic tetrameter; verse 14 combines an initial iamb to two trochees; verse 15 is a trochaic dimeter; verse 16 is a combination of three trochees and two iambs; verses 17 and 18 are iambic trimeter.

Prosthetic parallelism is present in verses 12-15 as against verses 16-18.

19 Εῖς Ἄ́ / δοῦ τ'οὔ / κᾱ τέ́ρ / χον ταί́ a

20 οὔ́τ'ἔ́ / στιν αὖ τοῖ́ς / φθό́ νος b

21 οὔ́ τε / στε νᾱ γμοί́ / οὔ́ τε / θά́ νᾱ τος b

22 ἄλλ, ἄ / νᾱ παύ́ /ον ταί́ a

23 τῷ̃ Ἄ́ /νᾱ παύ / ō μέ / νψ́ c

24 οὔ́ τε / κό́ πῑ / ὧν́ τες d

25 οὔ́ τε / ἔμ πλε / κό́ με / νοί́ e

26 Ἄ λή́ / θεῖ ά́ν / ζῆ τεῖ́ν. f

Verses 19 and 23 are iambic tetrameter; verse 20 has an initial iamb, an anapest and a trochee; verse 21 has a trochee, an anapest, a trochee and a final dactyl; verses 22 and 26 are iambic trimeter; verse 24 is a trochaic trimeter, and verse 25, a trochaic tetrameter. All verses include a prosthetic parallelism. The rhyme sequence is a,b,b,a,c,d,e,f.

27 Ἀλλ'αὖ τοί́ / ἦ Ἄ λή́ /θεῖ ά́ a

28 Πᾱ τήρ γά́ρ / ἐν αὖ τοῖ́ς b

29 αὖ τοῖ́ δ'ἔν /τῷ̃ Πᾱ τρί́ c

30 ἁ μέ / ρι στοι / καί τέ / λει οι c

31 ἅν τες ἐντ' / 'Α γα θῷ. d

Verse 27 is anapestic trimeter; verses 28 and 29 are anapestic dimeter; verse 30 is iambic tetrameter; verse 31 is a combination of a dactyl and an anapest. The rhyme sequence is a,b,c,c,d.

32 οὐ δε νί / ὑ στε ροῦ / σιν οὐ δε / νός,

33 ἁλ λά / ἁ να ψυ /γέν τες

34 Πνεύ μα τι / ἁ να παύ / ον ται.

Verse 32 is an anapestic tetrameter; verse 33 is a combination of an iamb, an anapest and a trochee; verse 34 is a combination of a dactyl and two anapests. These three verses include antithetic parallelisms.

35 Ρί ζης / τ'αὐ τῶν / ἁ κού / σον ται

36 σχο λά / σου σι / δ'αὐ τοῖς·

37 ἐν οἷσ / περ ρί / ζαν τήν / Αὐ τοῦ

38 εὐ ρή / σει καί / ζη μί / α

39 οὐκ ἔ / σται τῇ / Αὐ τοῦ / ψυ χῇ.

Verse 35 is a combination of a trochee and three iambs; verse 36 is an iambic trimeter, while verses 37, 38, and 39 are iambic tetrameter. Prosthetic parallelism is present in verses 35-36; antithetic parallelism occurs in verses 37 and 38 as against 39.

40 Οἷ / ος ἐ στι

41 μα κα ρί /ων ὁ τό / πος,

42 οἷ / ος ἐ στι

43 ὁ τό / πος ὁ /αὐ τῶν.

Verses 40 and 42 are trochaic dimeter; verse 41 is anapestic

dimeter while verse 43 is iambic trimeter. Prosthetic parallelism prevails in these verses.

EV 42. 39^{b} - 43. 8 disrupts the hymn for a statement on the part of the author that he has sojourned in the place of repose, he will keep silence on further information on that place, and made his decision to devote himself to the true brothers.

The last part of the hymn (43. 9-24) refers specifically to the Valentinians upon earth:

> [43. 9] It is they
> who manifest themselves [10] truly
> since they are
> in that true and eternal life
> and speak of the perfect Light
> filled with the seed of the Father,
> [15] which is in His Heart
> and in the Pleroma,
> while His Spirit
> rejoices in Him
> and glorifies Him
> in whom It exists,
> because He is good.
>
> And His children
> are [20] perfect
> and worthy of His Name,
> for they are children
> such as He, the Father loves.

1	ὀδ̄ τοῖ / δη̄ λοῖ / δ̄ λη̄ θῶς	a
2	ταῦ τῃ̄ / ὄν τες / τῃ̄ ζω̄ ῃ̄,	b
3	αἰ ω̄ / νί φ̄ / δ̄ λη̄ θεῖ	b
4	δῑ η̄ γού / με̄ νοί	b
5	φῶς τε̄ τό / τέ λεῑ ον̄	c
6	καί πε̄ / πλη̄ ρω̄ μέ / νόν	c
7	τοῦ̄ Πᾱ τρός / τοῦ̄ σπέρ / μᾱ τός	d
8	τοῦ̄ ἓν̄ / τῃ̄ καρ δί / ᾳ	e
9	καί ἓν̄ / τῷ̄ Πλη̄ ρώ / μᾱ τι	b

10 ⲁ̀ ⲅⲁ̄λ / λⲓ̄ ⲱ̄ μⲉ́ / νού f

11 Ⲁⲩ̄ τοῦ̀ / τⲉ̄ τοῦ̀ Πνεύ́ / μⲁ̄ τός d

12 δⲟ̄ ξⲁ́ / ζⲟ̄ν τⲟ̄ς ⲉ̀ / τⲓ́ b

13 ὅ̀ τⲓ̄ / ⲁ̄ γⲁ̄ θός́ / ⲉ̄ στίν b

14 ⲟ̄ ⲉ̀ν ⲧⲱ́ / ⲉ̄ στίν́. b

Verses 1, 2, and 3 have two trochees with a final anapest; verses 4 and 14 are anapestic dimeter; verse 5 is dactylic dimeter; verses 6, 8, 9, 10, and 13 have one trochee and two anapests; verse 7 has an anapest and two iambs; verses 11 and 12 have an iamb and two anapests. The rhyme sequence is a,b,b,b,c,c,d,e,b,f,d,b,b,b. The whole poem shows prosthetic parallelism.

1 ⲉⲓ̄ σⲓ́ / δⲉ̄ τⲉ́ / λⲉⲓ̄ οⲓ́ a

2 οⲓ́ / Ⲁⲩ̄ τοῦ̀ / υⲓ̄ οⲓ́ a

3 ⲉⲓ̄ σⲉ́ / τⲓ̄ δⲉ̄ ⲁ̀ / ξⲓ̄ οⲓ́ a

4 ⲟ̄ νό́ / μⲁ̄ τός́ / Ⲁⲟ̄ τοῦ̀ b

5 ὅ̀ τⲓ̄ / Πⲁ̄ τήρ́ / ⲉ̄ στί́. a

6 Οⲓ̄ οⲓ́ γⲁ́ρ / ⲉⲓ̄ σίν́ / υⲓ̄ οⲓ́ a

7 οὗ̈ς οὒ / τⲟ̄ς ⲁ̀ / γⲁ̄ πᾷ̀. c

Verses 1, 2, 4, and 7 are iambic trimeter; verse 3 is a combination of an iamb and two anapests; verse 5 has a trochee and two iambs while verse 6 combines a dactyl with two iambs. The rhyme sequence is a,a,a,b,a,a,c. The poem is controlled by a prosthetic parallelism.

The above extracts from the text of the Gospel of Truth differ in style from the rest of the text. They are also either preceded by introductions or followed by long or short commentaries.

While the style of the rest of the tractate is awkward, full

of platyasms with parentheses within parentheses, like algebraic equations that bring the reader into despair, the style of the parts that have been isolated is smooth; their clauses follow each other naturally, and the ideas are clear and simple. It still is the style of the Gospel of Truth, but of a different type. The vocabulary is the same, but the disposition of the writer and the construction of the clauses are different.

The extracts belong to another writing of the author, and since we know how the author writes his prose, or rather how he is "talking," without formality and pretension of writing a book, these extracts constitute his poetry. These pieces of poetry betray their presence as the underwater rocks raise their heads above the water, and become visible with the movement of the water. We have isolated several parts of a single poem, the Gospel Poem, and with a slight transposition of the words have witnessed with admiration how easily the words fit each other in order to form meter and verses. There would have been poetry in the text without meter. Augustin correctly states that, "omne metrum rhythmus, sed non omnis rhythmus etiam metrum,"[1] but the poem has both rhythm and meter. It has primarily two basic metric patterns: the iambic and the trochaic. Again it prefers the trimeter and tetrameter combinations. Occasionally we have discovered an anapestic meter and above all a close parallelism between Valentinus' Theros and three segments of the poem. EV 36. 26-31 present a common phenomenon with the Harvest of Valentinus. Both have a series of verses depending, actually hanging from the

---

[1]Augustin De Musica, J. P. Migne P. L., xxxii. 1116.

verb of the first sentence, and they follow each other as in a parade.

This poem is not the Psalter mentioned by Tertullian, but perhaps Tertullian loosely used the term "psalms," or Valentinus' poetical activity has not been confined into "psalm" writing. The fact that the author comments on his poetic paragraphs or introduces them with explanatory notes means that the "Poem" is for him a scriptural text, a Gospel Poem similar to the Prologue of the Gospel of John. He uses freely, however, his poems and dissolves them at will incorporating them into his prosaic homily making the distinction between poetry and commentary not discernible at a first glance.

The poem also shows traces of antithetic, synonymic, prosthetic, and escalative parallelism, and the elegiac verse, with Hebrew meter kina, familiar in the lamentations of Jeremiah where the second clause is shorter than the first. All these are evidences that Valentinus, in addition to his Greek training, was also at home with Biblical poetry, which was known to him through the Septuagint translation. The kina rhythm belongs to mourning and sorrow, and betrays the pessimistic character of Valentinus. He applied it also to non-sorrowful circumstances but he knew from Greek poetry that elegiacic meters were not confined to dirge and that there were elegies written in non-elegiacic meter. The meter, however, appealed to him. He preached the joy of the discovery of the Gospel of Truth, but the question is whether he actually experienced that joy, at least for a long time. In this, his temperament is quite opposite to that of the author of the Odes of Solomon.

His poetical parallels to the Odes of Solomon, however, must

be noted. They consist both in poetry and in poetical expressions like the mouth-to-mouth communication upon the reception of the Holy Spirit, which only on the basis of the Odes can be understood, otherwise remain a riddle.

The secrecy of the Valentinian teaching points to an early date of the composition of the tractate, while the presence of poetry in it is additional evidence that it was composed by a poet. This being so, we have further evidence that Valentinus is the author of the Gospel Poem and, I believe, of the whole "homily," since he was known as one of the second-century Christian poets and since any other contemporary poet, such as Marcion or Bardaisan, must be excluded. The author of the Odes of Solomon might be considered but, it seems to me, that he is more spontaneous and of a higher inspiration than Valentinus. The latter is rather sophisticated and systematic, and his Logos poetry is rather removed from the Sophia poetry of the poet of the Odes, even though the ties between the Sophia and the Logos theology have not been broken altogether. Unless, of course, we are ready to assume that Valentinus wrote the Odes prior to his elaboration of the theology of the Gospel of Truth, and to his lapse to pessemism. The Odes are characterized by a bright psychology of triumphant faith and hope, even though they mention sorrows and tribulations. Pessemism, however, according to this study, has been the dominant tone in Valentinus' psychology from the years of his youth, and it is quite incompatible with the disposition of the poet of the Odes. One is tempted to say that Valentinus stands closer to the psychology of the Dead Sea hymns than to the Odes. Rest, if any, is the final stage of his development, not his starting point.

The Poem as a Gospel

The content of the poem is extremely important for the identification of the type of literature to which it belongs. An overview of its main themes will prove this.

If labeled with titles, the isolated extracts give the following picture:

A. The Gospel: 16. 31-34 (as joy); 17. 2-4 (as Hope); 18. 12-24 as Jesus Christ, a hidden mystery, who shows a path); 33. 30-35 (a kerygmatic admonition).

B. The Father: 20. 19 (as unique being); 18. 37 (as perfect); 19. 19; 20. 9 (the Father and the All); 36. 35-37 (on the goodness of the Father who knows his plantings).

C. The Logos: 23. 19-32 (to the Generation of the Logos); 23. 33 - 24. 8 (Hymn on the Procession of the Logos through the All); 24. 9-19 (on the revelation of the Trinity through the Logos to the aeons); 26. 4-23 (on the confusion provoked by the aeons on the appearance of the Logos); 34. 29 - 35. 2 (on the reason of the advent of the Logos).

D. On the Incarnation: 31. 4-35 (the Logos came in a similitude of Flesh; His work); 18. 24-34 (on the Crucifixion, Christ as a Fruit of the Tree of Knowledge); 20. 20 (on the Crucifixion and the Resurrection).

E. Sin: 28. 26-28 (the sin of the Gnostic); 24. 29-32 (on the Knowledge and the Ignorance of the Father).

F. The redeemed aeons: EV 22. 13 (the Gnostic); EV 26. 28-30 (the aeons salute the Father on the appearance of Truth); EV 26. 33 (exchange of kiss between the Trinity and the Gnostic); EV 30. 13-26 (praise of the Gnostic, his resurrection, his Knowledge of the Trinity); EV 32. 32 - 33. 21 with the exception of 32. 22 - 33. 30^{b} (praise of the Gnostic).

G. Eschatology: EV 25. 23-25 (the house is silent); EV 41. 13 - 42. 39 (the place); EV 43. 7-24 (the place on earth).

A short review of this material will lead us to the following conclusions.

In the first place we have both Gospel and Teaching. The Gospel is a joyous message on Jesus' arrival, a ground of hope of salva-

tion, a mystery. Since Truth is equivalent to Jesus Christ, the author might have started in the manner of Mark: The Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Gospel corresponds to Kerygma.

The message is supplemented with a Didactic admonition with commandments and prohibitions, and with a praise of the disciples.[1] The Gnostics are called "the day from on high." The admonition ends with the conclusive words: "Do you therefore the will of the Father for you are from Him." The conclusion resembles a similar conclusion in Matthew 5:48.

After the Gospel proper and its Didactic accretion we have speculations on subjects such as the Father, the Logos, the Incarnation, sin, the redeemed group, which may correspond to our soteriology, and, finally eschatology.

We must also take into account the several parables of the Gospel. Such are the parable of the Nightmare, of the Lost Sheep, of the Intoxicated Man, of the Sleeping Man, of the Change of Home, and Breaking of Old Vessels, etc. These, of course, are not given in a poetical form, and serve as illustrations to the main themes of the author.

All the poetical passages are included in the isolated parts of the EV and constitute a different text within the Gospel to which the rest serves as a commentary and as an illustration.

The author meant to reproduce the Gospel type of literature including the message, instruction, and the additional theological

---

[1]Cf. Matthew 5:13-14: "You are the salt . . . you are the light of the world."

speculations which already appear in the fourth Gospel. His two passages on the Crucifixion are a proof that he wanted to focus his attention on the passion of Jesus. This was the nucleus around which the whole Gospel story arose.

On the basis of these facts, we may surmise that the Gospel of Truth is not a mere meditation on the Gospel, but a Gospel in the whole sense of the word that includes interpretation or meditation. If this is true, the title as Gospel of Truth holds good. Irenaeus' and contemporary notions are ungrounded. The "Incipit" serves as a title.

Whether the Gospel was a Baptismal or a Confirmation Homily meant to be read at the liturgy is immaterial. As a Gospel, it could be read at liturgy. This, however, will not confine it either to Baptism or to Confirmation. Other sacraments are hinted by its text also.

It is possible that in our Gospel we have two distinct works, the Gospel, that Pseudo-Tertullian mentions as the work of Valentinus, and a homily which incorporated parts of the original Gospel, the parts that we have isolated and perhaps others, as proof-texts for his homilies. If this is the case the complete text of Gospel of Truth has not yet been found. Excerpts from it have been preserved by our document which are sufficient to give us an idea of the structure of Valentinus' Gospel and his main ideas.

The possible existence of two documents possibly accounts for the two different ways the Church Fathers referred to it. Irenaeus might have in mind the document and for this reason he refers

not to Valentinus but to the Valentinians as the group which used it. On the contrary, Tertullian may refer to the original work that Valentinus himself had written and, therefore, without hesitation he attributes the Gospel to his pen.

The commentary is no doubt Valentinian. It even may be the teaching of Valentinus himself who by teaching and repeating himself created an oral tradition, where formulas, parables, similes, etc., became stereotyped. His rhetorical questions, which are present in the Gospel, may be actual questions of people who approached him and became his disciples. They may also reflect objections of his opponents--Jews, Christians, or pagans.

As stated above, the Gospel may have been formulated in a poetical or semipoetical form, as a poetical prose. We know, however, that Ancient Christianity knows almost nothing about Valentinus' poetry. Valentinus' disciples, on the other hand, followed the way of theoretical speculation in terms of prose.

There is patristic evidence to the existence of a Gospel or a Gospel of Truth in the second century A.D. as stated above.

Pseudo-Tertullian informs us that Valentinus "also has his own Gospel beyond these of ours."[1]

While Pseudo-Tertullian specifies the author, Irenaeus says that the Valentinians had composed (the) Gospel of Truth which, according to him, was totally unlike the Canonical Gospels.[2] He does not state that the Valentinians wrote the new Gospel, but only that

---

[1]Pseudo-Tertullian Against All Heresies iv.

[2]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. iii. 11. 8-9.

those who follow Valentinus (sect. 8) or are from him (sect. 9) put forth or possess (sect. 9) their own compositions[1] of which the Gospel of Truth is comparatively recent. The authorship is not stated, but on the other hand, Valentinus is not excluded.

For Irenaeus the very designation Gospel of Truth implies that the canonical gospels, written by the apostles, according to him, were not true. Thus, he interpreted the title of the Valentinian production as denoting a contrast to the Gospels of the Church. He also states that the content of the Gospels was totally different.

The use of the term "Gospel" by Irenaeus is equivocal. It means the evangelical message in a Pauline sense, but also the literary documents that contained it. The latter, he believes, cannot be more than four and this on the basis of numerical and imaginary speculations that he develops in a genuine Valentinian manner. Accordingly, the new "Gospel" is a "blasphemy."

Contemporary students of the Gospel of Truth have maintained that the new document has no narratives, sayings or parables or discourses of Jesus, in spite of several allusions to them and in particular to the Passion. The word "Truth" in the title, however, is not meant to oppose the Gospel to the existing ones. Truth in it is equivalent to Logos or Son, therefore, it might just as well be called the Gospel of the Logos or the Gospel of the Son. The Gospel is also different from the gospel type known to us from the Apocryphal Gospels. The closest parallel to it is the Gospel of John.

The first editors identified the document from its "incipit." Modern students of the Gospel insist that the "incipit" is not a title,

---

[1]Note the use of the plural.

as it is for so many ancient books. It was known as such, however, by the members of the Esoteric Valentinian group and as such it reached the ears of Irenaeus.

Irenaeus heard about it as of a Gospel in the loose sense of the word, as good tidings or as a meditation on them.[1] Irenaeus quotes EV 31. 35 on the lost sheep, and on the passing from the number ninety-nine to one hundred, by going from the left hand to the right. He informs us that Marcus the Magician had translated this method of counting into an apocryphal numerical theory and used it as such.[2]

The patristic evidence as to the existence of a Valentinian Gospel that was used by the Valentinian sect and rejected by Irenaeus leaves very little doubt that this Gospel is the newly discovered document which begins with the words "The Gospel of Truth is joy to . . ." (EV 16. 31).

The document in all probability had no other title, since in the manuscript there is no room for a title between the preceding tractate, an apocryphal letter to James, and itself. Two embellished lines separate the one work from the other. In the Jung Codex this is the only tractate which has no title. The first tractate has the title, "The Epistle of James," the third, "Epistle to Reghinus on the Resurrection," the fourth, "On the Three Natures," and the fifth, "Prayer of the Apostle." Thus, the second document of the Codex is

---

[1]Cf. EV 37. 3: "These are the words of His meditation."

the only one which appears without a title. It is legitimate, therefore, to accept that for the copyist, and also for his source, the "incipit" served as a title.

The divergence of the document from the usual Gospel type of literature that Irenaeus and modern students have noticed is no reason that it should not have been labeled as a "Gospel." Hans Jonas has shown how broad use of the title "Gospel" was made among the Gnostics. The "Gospel according to the Egyptians" is a "Holy Book of the invisible Great Spirit"; it deals with the Great Seth and the name of Jesus does not appear in it a single time.[1]

The Gospel of Truth has several references to the historical Jesus and to His Passion. Let us remember that the passion story was the nucleus around which the gospel story arose, in spite of the fact that a docetic interpretation of the story of Jesus is quite possible as a total transposition of history into a suprahistorical plan.

This study has made clear, it seems to the writer, that it was the intention of the author to write a Gospel-type literature. This is the reason that he placed so much stress on the Passion and omitted the bulk of information on the story of Jesus that we see in other representatives of that form of literature. Allusions to the historical Jesus, however, are not absent from it, but the author transposes them into a superhistorical plan. The Gospel of Truth is a Gnostic Gospel, therefore, it has little interest in history as such.

---

[1]Hans Jonas, Gnosis und spätantike Geist ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des A.T. und N. T.," Vol. I, No. 51; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964), p. 408.

The Gospel of Truth as a Cryptic Document

Like the Odes of Solomon[1] the Gospel of Truth is meant to be an esoteric and cryptic writing. The author, by the end of his treatise, makes the statement: "As for the rest, may they know, each in his own place, that it does not suit me, after having sojourned in the place of Repose, to say anything more" (EV 42. 39 - 43. 2). To this statement corresponds the whole structure of the work. The Gospel is full of allusions and intentionally has gaps which for the initiated are self-explanatory, but for the outsider, a riddle.

This cryptic character of the Gospel explains the absence of an elaborate system of aeons similar to that of other Valentinian sources. Like the Essenes who kept secret the names of the angels, the Valentinians tried to keep secret, but not very successfully, the names of the aeons. The vocabulary of the Gospel is to a great extent a secret code that the student has to decipher in order to enter the sanctuary of the Valentinian temple.

This cryptic character dissolves much of the "Orthodoxy" of the Gospel of Truth of which scholars have spoken.

The myth of Sophia may be absent by name, but it is present in it since the world is the result of someone's passions. There are no syzygies, but the Father and the Holy Spirit constitutes in it a male and female couple, which generates the Son. There is only one Son and Logos, but the aeons are both sons and logoi and the Logos operates on different levels as movements of thought and feeling of the Divinity.[2] There is a Trinity in it, as in the Odes of Solomon,

---

[1] OS 8. 10. [2] Tertullian Adversus Valentinianos iv.

but with a tendency of expansion into a broader Pleroma. The Pleroma is actually an expansion of the Trinity, the two members of which--the Spirit and the Logos--are split into spirits and logoi. There is no mention of the Demiurge in our writing, but Error acts as an artisan and manufactures an unsuccessful composition that is only a caricature of the true world above. The Gnostics did not deny the doctrine of creation, but they confined it to a superior world. The Father has no complete alibi for the appearance of the aeons.

All these and other Valentinian elements are presupposed by our author who, however, knows when and where to stop. He is not supposed to reveal his entire doctrine. The Gospel is meant to be manifested only to the perfect (EV 18. 14) and a revelation of its content to the common Christian not only would be a waste of a treasure, but also it would have given the Christian Church more and better weapons in her polemic against the Valentinian sect. Missonary policy would not create unnecessary difficulties. Furthermore a secret doctrine has the attraction of the mysterious. Had the author of the Gospel given more freedom to his pen, he might have surprised us with some of his theological concepts. These became known in the course of time and we find them in the writings of the ecclesiastical fathers.

CHAPTER V

THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND LITURGY

The Gospel Poem was not composed by Valentinus for itself. Ars gratia artis could not be the guiding principle of a man who decided to spend the rest of his life in the service of the "true brothers." As the whole "homily" was a means of instruction of the "brothers," the Gospel Poem was meant both for instruction and also for liturgical purposes.

Söderbergh's theory that our tractate is a Baptismal Homily was recently coupled by Segelberg's suggestion that it is a "Confirmation" homily. The writer cannot accept that particular application of the Liturgical Hypothesis on the ground that Baptism and Confirmation constituted not two rites but one. The contrast between the two rites in the Gospel of Truth is not an antithesis between Baptism and Confirmation but between two kinds of Baptism, i.e., the cold psychic baptism of the Church at large, which the Valentinians considered as "Psychic" and the "Hot" or "Pneumatic" Baptism conferred by the Valentinian sect. No contrast between two Valentinian sacraments would be understandable.

It is possible that the Gospel Poem was also used in other Valentinian liturgical gatherings. In this chapter we must consider Söderbergh's and Segelberg's positions and insist on the unity of baptism and confirmation. The discussion cannot be separated from the

liturgical character of the Odes of Solomon, since this "Hymnal" was the first to be characterized as a Baptismal poetry.

The Gospel of Truth as a Baptismal Homily

The question of the liturgical use of the Gospel of Truth leads us to the discussion of Valentinian sacraments and especially those of Baptism and Unction.

Irenaeus informs us that some Valentinians had rejected all sacramental practices maintaining that "the mystery of the unspeakable and invisible power ought not to be performed by visible and corruptible creatures." Redemption, therefore, according to them, must be purely spiritual and this consisted in "knowledge."[1]

Redemption, however, for others was related to material elements, such as water, oil, chrism, and ministering human beings performing it. Irenaeus in the same chapter describes this Redemption and discusses the variations in its performance.[2] It is pertinent, therefore, to examine the Gospel of Truth against the background of liturgy.

Säve-Söderbergh suggested that the Gospel of Truth is a Baptismal homily, and that it can be understood only if projected against the background of Valentinian Baptism.[3]

On the basis of the theory advanced here about the existence

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 21. 4.

[2] Ibid., i. 21. 3-4.

[3] Säve-Söderbergh, Religion och Bibel, XVII, 23-29.

of two texts, it would be safer to accept that only the poetical parts could be used in liturgy, while the targumistic interpretations perhaps were used as catechetical lessons for the catechumenes. The whole Gospel, of course, might have served as a catechism or a textbook for them.

The discussion did not stop, however, and the Baptismal suggestion was soon modified by further research.

Eric Segelberg discusses the terminology of the Gospel of Truth in relation to Baptism and in comparison to the Odes of Solomon.[1] Segelberg's starting point is J. H. Bernard's theory who had maintained as early as 1913 that the Odes of Solomon are Baptismal hymns meant to be used in connection with the Baptismal liturgy.[2] His second source is Säve-Söderbergh who discovered the lost pages of the Gospel of Truth, pages 33-36, in 1958. The latter's point of view is that the Gospel of Truth is a Baptismal homily meant to be spoken but not written.[3]

Segelberg's own contribution to the problem of Baptism is to be found in his published doctoral dissertation, Maṣbūtā: A Study in the Ritual of the Mandaean Baptism.[4] Segelberg's main point in the afore-mentioned article (footnote 1, below) presupposes the existence of Baptism. Its emphasis, however, falls not on Baptism but on Chris-

---

[1]Segelberg, Orientalia Suecana, VII, 3-42.

[2]J. H. Bernard, The Odes of Solomon ("Texts and Studies," Vol. VIII, No. 3; Cambridge: The University Press, 1913).

[3]Säve-Söderbergh, Religion och Bibel, XVII, 20 seq.

[4]Eric Segelberg, Maṣbūtā: A Study in the Ritual of the Mandaean Baptism (Uppsala: Almquist and Wiksells, 1958).

mation.[1] Thus, not Baptismal water but "Chrism" and "Unction" is the prevalent theme in it. Accordingly, the EV is not a Baptismal homily, as Säve-Söderbergh suggests, but a Confirmation homily to be addressed to the neophytes at the postbaptismal meal and in connection with the sacraments of Unction and Communion.[2]

While in agreement with Bernard, Segelberg accepts that the Odes of Solomon are centered about the rite of Baptism, yet he has his own suggestion for the EV which he considers a Confirmation homily. The Odes of Solomon, he says, have postbaptismal acts such as the raising up, perfection, milk and honey and, possibly, seal and sign, and yet surprisingly "Chrism" is absent from them. It would seem most unlikely that the Odes were regarded as intended for the use of a group of baptized but not confirmed faithful. Therefore, he concludes, we must emphasize not the kinship, but the difference between the EV and the Odes of Solomon.

From a liturgical point of view this suggestion brings him into disagreement with both Schenke and Braun who stress the close relationship between the EV and the OS.[3]

The "Confirmation Homily" Hypothesis

Segelberg divides the Baptism and Chrism liturgy into three stages: Preparation, Baptism proper, and Chrismation rites.[4] The first includes the following rites: exorcism, ephphatha or opening of the eyes of the candidate, Repentance or turning, the stretching of the hands, and insuflation.

---

[1] Segelberg, Orientalia Suecana, VIII, 41.

[2] Ibid., pp. 15-16. [3] Ibid., p. 42. [4] Ibid., p. 41.

All these occur in the EV. The second, third, and last of them are alluded to in a vague way in the OS. Turning, stretching out of the hands, and insuflation, however, may be considered also as postbaptismal rites.[1]

The second, or Baptismal rite proper, includes immersion, investiture, coronation, signation, seal, the minister of waters and drinking Baptismal water. Of these there are vague allusions of investiture and coronation only in the EV, while Baptism in water, even though known in the EV, is not mentioned explicitly. All rites, however, except signation and seal, appear in the OS.[2] Since Confirmation is the center of liturgical attention in the EV, one is not expected to find Baptismal rites there, while the OS, a Baptismal hymn book, has them.[3]

Confirmation rites are explicit in the EV with main emphasis on Unction itself. In addition to Unction these rites are: seal, signation, fragrance, perfection, raising up, plantation, being a vessel, milk and honey, communion, and receiving light. All of these are present in EV with the exception of milk and honey communion. The last four are present in the OS also. Seal, signation, fragrance, and perfection are vaguely alluded to, while in it Unction is absent.

These comparisons, Segelberg goes on to say, establish the cardinal difference between the OS and the EV. The method of approach, however, is not self-evident for the reader.

While no mention is made of the problem of the date of the OS, the date of composition of the EV is placed early in the third century

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid., p. 42.

A.D., even though this "seems less probable."[1] The reasons for this are that "neither the problem of the authorship of the EV nor its definite Valentinian character have been proved." Segelberg knows, however, that at the end of the second century Irenaeus and Tertullian speak about liturgical rites and early in the third century we have the first description of the rites of Baptism and Confirmation. A later date for the composition of the EV fits the above data, therefore he prefers it. Those, however, who believe that the EV was written by the middle of the second century, are not prepared to accept a later date without sufficient reason, other than the exigencies of the liturgical interpretation of the EV. Segelberg knows the difficulties of this interpretation. The influence of the Biblical terminology both of the Old and of the New Testaments on our texts, the possibility of metaphorical interpretation, and the late date of our liturgical sources, do not prevent him from sticking to his point.

The Mandaean ritual may be rooted in early tradition, but since Lietzmann's study of the Mandaean problem, we must be careful in our interpretation. The Mandaean community reflects, in addition, ideas and practices of the late Byzantine (Jacobite) Church and instead of being its source, it may be the outcome of early Christianity.[2] Segelberg himself, after a minute examination of the various rites, is forced either to deny kinship between the two documents,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 4.

[2] Hans Lietzmann, "Ein Beitrag zu Mandäerfrage," Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, XXVII (November 6, 1930), 595 seq.

the EV and the OS, or accept a vague one. In most cases, he admits that the texts just allude to liturgical practices.

The emphasis on Baptism on the part of the OS has not been proved. Harris and Mingana, in spite of their few concessions to the theory of baptismal allusions and perhaps of the admission that Baptism is not unknown in the OS, reject Bernard's liturgical (Baptismal) interpretation of the Odes. Baptism is not the main theme of the Odes and Bernard's arguments have not convinced them.

Apart from the question of a detailed ritual lying behind our texts, the absence of Chrismation from the OS and the emphasis on it in EV are facts. One who accepts that, is not bound to accept an elaborate ritual underlying the texts. The separation of Baptism from Chrismation in space and time, however, is not well founded.[1] We have evidence that the term SPHRAGIS-Seal was applied by Theodotus to Baptism.[2] Baptism and Name are connected indissolubly,[3] and even angels are sealed by the baptismal grace.[4]

If Confirmation and Baptism are not separate ceremonies in the EV, the "Confirmation Homily" hypothesis of Segelberg falls by itself. What shall we say, then, about the depreciation of the "cold fragrance" emphasis of the EV? The answer is given by Segelberg himself, who does not realize its complications for his whole theory.

Commenting on EV 36. 22-24 on the vanishment of someone's

---

[1] Segelberg, Orientalia Suecana, VIII, 42.

[2] Excerpt. Theol. 83 and 83. 3.

[3] Sagnard, Sources Chrétiennes, XXIII, 237.

[4] Excerpt. Theol. 22. 5.

unction he states: "This is probably an antichristian text. When a Gnostic is deceived into receiving Christian baptism and chrism, a wind [i.e., the Holy Spirit, which from the Valentinian point of view is evil, liturgically expressed by an insuflation, an act of Christian initiation] 'exorcizes,' carries off the 'gnostic unction.'"[1] The "Psychic" Baptism of EV 34. 19 is nothing else than the Baptism and Chrism of the Church taken together in contrast to the same sacraments of the Valentinians. The Valentinians would not depreciate their own sacraments contrasting Baptism and Chrism. Their opposition is rather directed to the practices of the Christian Church.

Irenaeus mentions no such opposition between Baptism and Confirmation but between Baptism and Baptism; namely, between the Baptism of Regeneration practiced by the Church and Baptism-Redemption practiced by the Valentinians.[2] Both rites probably included imposition of hands or anointment by unction. Valentinian Baptism, Irenaeus says, was an invention of Satan to deny the Baptism of Regeneration.[3]

The "Psychic" Baptism of the Church and the Valentinian "Pneumatic" Baptism

There exists a Valentinian interpretation of Baptism according to which there are two kinds of Baptisms--the Psychic and the Pneumatic.

The ordinary Christian Baptism conferred by the Church is the Baptism that has been announced by John the Baptist, and it is a Bap-

---

[1] Segelberg, Orientalia Suecana, VIII, 14.

[2] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1. 21. 1.

[3] Sagnard, Études de Philosophie Médiévale, XXXVI, 241.

tism of Repentance. This Baptism is reserved for the ordinary Christian, and its character is preparatory only and psychic.

The Valentinian Baptism, on the other hand, is known as Apolytrosis and "Redemption" and corresponds to the reception of the Logos. As such, it is the condition of the entrance to the Pleroma. It was brought by Christ to the purpose of granting perfection.[1] Upon his acceptance to the Valentinian Church the candidate had to submit to the rite of Redemption.

On the basis of the Excerpta of Theodotus,[2] Sagnard reviews the subject of Baptism and its Valentinian interpretation in the second century A.D.[3] His main points are reproduced here.

Baptism is related to water and Spirit.[4] Water is not ψιλόν ὕδωρ ; but water consecrated by the invocation of the Holy Spirit.[5] Theodotus joins together "αἰσθητόν" and "νοητόν" Baptism, i.e., Baptism by water which is Psychic and the Pneumatic Baptism. Thus he refers to a double Baptism, not to Baptism and Confirmation.[6]

Dölger maintains that in the second century A.D. the action of the Spirit was attributed to the Logos; in Excerpta 82. 2, however,

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 21. 1. Cf. Sagnard, Études de Philosophie Médiévale, XXXVI, 405.

[2] Excerpt. Theod. 67-86.

[3] Sagnard, Sources Chrétiennes, XXIII, 229-239.

[4] John I:26.

[5] E. Preuschen, "Origenes Werke," Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1903), IV, 512.

[6] Excerpt. Theod. 81. 2.

Dölger sees the first instance of the consecration of the baptismal Water by the Spirit.[1] Sagnard believes that Excerpta (82-83) refer to the sanctifying power of the Spirit, not of the Logos.

The operation of the Spirit on water is double: negative and positive. It is negative in the sense of eliminating the evil spirits from it and positive because it endows it with the power of santification.[2]

Baptism acts on the human person in two ways: it gives the neophyte power over the evil spirits and Fate, and also power over the material world, the physical body, corruption and death.

Baptism is a second generation as contrasted to physical birth, since the latter introduces us to the physical world where death prevails. Baptism is a death to the death of the World, namely, Resurrection.[3] It is also equivalent to formation by Gnosis.[4]

Baptism is related to the Name of God and in particular to the Trinitarian formula. It is a baptism in the Name, therefore, EV 38. 28 is right in calling the Gnostics "sons of the Name."

Such Baptism is also called Seal "Sphragis." This seal is marking the Neophyte when the Name of the Trinity is invoked.[5] This happens when we descend to the water.[6]

The Seal is equivalent to the letters of Christ, to the in-

---

[1] Dölger, Franz J. " ΙΧΘΥΣ : Das Fischsymbol in Frühchristlicher Zeit," I. Band. Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen (Rom: In Kommission der Herder'schen Verlagshandlung zur Freiburg i. B. und der Buchhandlung Spithöven zu Rom, 1910), p.70.

[2] Excerpt. Theod. 81-82. Cf. Sagnard, Sources Chretiennes, XXIII, 233.

[3] Excerpt. Theod. 77. 1.

[4] Ibid., 78. 2.

[5] Ibid., 80. 3.

[6] Ibid., 83.

scription of the Name of God; it is the Image and the Effigy of the Spirit; it is similar to the mark put on the skin of the animals to denote their owner; it is Ceasar's coin with his image and inscription on it.[1] This Seal is the Seal of Baptism. The demons can have it also; therefore, they try to descend into the water together with the Neophyte in order to take the Seal. That latter, however, makes the evil spirits stronger in their fight against man.[2]

Baptism and Confirmation as One Rite

Gregory Dix related the Seal to the Seal of Circumcision and to the Shekinah which was a rabbinical symbol of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, he saw in the Seal the gift of the Holy Spirit, i.e., our own Confirmation, and considered Confirmation, Eucharist and Baptism as one and the same initiatory rite.[3] The mention of Bread and Oil in connection to Baptismal Water in Excerptum 82, I would favor such an interpretation. It is, however, uncertain whether oil is the Confirmation Unction. The Greek Church today mixes blessed oil to the water before Baptism and the candidate is anointed with it before immersion. Immediately after Baptism the person is anointed with the Confirmation Unction which is a different oil which has been blessed by bishops. The practice goes back at least to the fourth century A.D.

---

[1] Ibid., 86. 2. See also, Sagnard, Sources Christiennes, XXIII, 233.

[2] This idea has survived in the Baptismal rite of the Eastern Church where God is asked by the priest not to allow any evil spirit to descend into the water together with the candidate bringing thus darkening of thoughts and turmoil of the mind.

[3] Gregory Dix, "The Seal in the Second Century A.D.," Theology, LI, No. 3 (January, 1948), 7-12. See also, Sagnard, Sources Christiennes, XXIII, 238.

The mention of bread and oil in connection with baptismal water in Excerptum (82. 1) would favor such an interpretation. It is uncertain, however, whether oil here is the Confirmation Unction. Irenaeus describes the various Valentinian rites of redemption.[1] These consist in the following practices: Baptism in water mixed with oil.[2] Pouring of the mixture and oil on the head of the person.[3] Repetition of the same rite in the case of a dying man.[4] All these cases refer to a mixture of oil and water.[5]

Mention is also made of a balsam.[6] It seems that those groups who accepted "visible and corruptible" material sacramental means used it in their rites. The question is, however, whether the anointing took place before or after Baptism. In the case of the Baptism of the dying, the mixture of oil and water is mentioned, but not of balsam. We may assume, however, that balsam and oil here are identical and that the pouring of the mixture on the head is enough. No substitution of water by oil or balsam is mentioned. Balsam alone serves for the anointment of the body. It is very possible that the anointment took place before the immersion, as in the Greek Church up to this day. The whole rite is called Redemption and in the case of the Baptism of the dying man we heard of the escapement of the soul of the dead from the powers. If this is the case, then we have here

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. ii. 21. 3-4. [2] Ibid., i. 21. 4.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid., i. 21. 5.

[5] Cf. The same practice in the Byzantine Baptismal ritual.

[6] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 3. 4-5.

one of the main effects of Baptism, namely, escape from powers here, and in the hereafter.[1]

We may in this connection mention once more the two playwords mentioned by Ménard in reference to oil and to Chrism. EV 36. 13-17 states that the Valentinians: "Χριστόν ἔλεγαν, ἵνα χρίσῃ αὐτούς χρίσματι ."[2] On this Ménard has a different translation: "[13] ἀμετάτρεπτον.Τοῦθ'ἕνεκα περί [14] Χριστοῦ ἐλάλησαν ἐν τῷ [15] μέσῳ αὐτῶν,ἵνα ἐπιστρέψωνται [16] οἱ θεμβωθέντες καί λάβωσι [17] τό χρῖσμα παρ'αὐτοῦ." The other passage is EV 36. 18-20: "τό δέ ἔλαιον, τό ἔλεος τοῦ Πατρός,ὅς ἐλεήσῃ αὐτούς ." Ménard has:"τό χρῖσμα [18] τό ἔλεος τοῦ Πατρός τοῦ ἐλεήσαντος [19] αὐτούς ."

It is certain that oil and ointment go together, but the uncertainty of the role of the oil in Irenaeus holds good also for these texts, and Perfection ,τελειότης,is a part of the Apolytrosis where there is a contrast between the Christian and the Valentinian Baptism.[3] Baptism is important for the Valentinians; even angels receive it for our sakes according to Theodotus.[4]

On the basis of the above considerations we can say that the equation of Seal and the Gift of the Holy Spirit is not sound from a doctrinal point of view. In Valentinianism there is no room for the development of a doctrine of the Gift of the Spirit. The Spirit is not an additional gift but the very substance of the Gnostic who by

---

[1]Excerpt. Theod. 24.

[2]Segelberg, Orientalia Suecana, VIII, 13.

[3]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 21. 2.

[4]Excerpt. Theod. 22. 4.

definition is spiritual.[1] Salvation for the Valentinian is inevitable and natural.[2] The Valentinian simply rediscovers his "essential being."[3] EV 21. 21 is typically Valentinian here. Each one is supposed to ascend to the Father and receive what is his own, not a gift.

There is mention of Grace in EV.[4] It even may mean favor or gift; the gift, however, is what already belongs to the Valentinian.[5] The ascent-descent process of the spiritual element is superimposition of strata and substrata. The spirit enters an animal soul and then an animal body, and afterwards, it leaves both behind and reenters the Pleroma, naked of both. The psychic man, therefore, receives nothing, and the "gift" itself, or the spiritual element, is saved. Ralph Marcus refused to call this process a giving and receiving transaction,[6] and, in turn, he was right in disagreeing with Quispel who called the Valentinian myth an uncompromising statement of a doctrine of salvation by grace and election.[7]

The reception of the Logos in the rite of Redemption, or Valentinian Baptism, has an educative character. It helps the spirit-

---

[1]Early in the twentieth century, Apostolos Makrakis in Greece renewed that Valentinian doctrine of the Spirit as being a constituent element of man.

[2]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 7. 5.

[3]EV 41. 7. [4]EV 16. 32; 34. 2; 36. 3. 7; 37. 12.

[5]EV 16. 32.

[6]Ralph A. Marcus, "Pleroma and Fulfillment: The Significance of History in St. Irenaeus' Opposition to Gnosticism," Vigiliae Christianae, VIII (1954), 211.

[7]Gilles Quispel, "La Conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentienne," Eranos Jahrbuch, 1947, pp. 249-86.

ual germ grow up and take form through Gnosis. It aims at τελείωσις, perfection.[1] The psychic man cannot receive it. Perfection, therefore, and the corresponding idea of unction and aroma in the EV refer to the rite of Redemption, not to a separate ceremony of Confirmation. If, therefore, we should have to accept a liturgical interpretation of the EV, we should side with Säve-Söderbergh's view of the EV as a baptismal homily,[2] and not with Segelberg's interpretation of it as a confirmation homily. Baptism and confirmation are inseparable.

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 21. 2.

[2] Säve-Söderbergh, Religion och Bibel, XVII, 29-36.

CHAPTER VI

THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND VALENTINIANISM

So far this study has insisted on the poetical and liturgical character of the Gospel of Truth. It has also emphasized the Valentinian authorship of the work. The Gospel Poem and its Commentary are Valentinus' composition which was meant by its author to be used for instructive and liturgical purposes.

The only proof that has been given so far in favor of the view that Valentinus is the author is the poetical nature of a part of the tractate. He was one of the second-century Christian poets and in the Harvest we have a sample of his poetry. There is no other poet in the second century A.D. to whom we may attribute the Gospel Poem.

In some circles, however, not only the Valentinian authorship but the Valentinian character of the Gospel has been altogether denied. Only its Gnostic nature has been accepted, but again under the specification that the tractate stands close to Catholic Orthodoxy.

In view of this situation it is imperative to stress not only the generally Gnostic, but also the specifically Valentinian character of the work. The Gospel offers sufficient evidence that it belongs to the Valentinian school of thought. It presupposes the existence of a more or less complete system of Valentinian doctrine,

the Sophia myth included; it has allusions to a developed Pleroma; it knows the doctrine of the "Three Natures," the pneumatic, the psychic and the hylic which are essential to Valentinianism; it agrees with the system of Ptolemy in general terms; it includes well-attested Valentinian formulas and, above all, it agrees with the doctrine of the Valentinian fragments.

All these agreements evidence to one fact; namely, that the Gospel of Truth is a product of the Valentinian school of thought and this paves the way for the view that it is Valentinus' work.

Valentinianism, however, is a complicated phenomenon. It presents several phases of development and is divided into schools. The Gospel of Truth presupposes a developed Valentinian doctrine, therefore, it cannot be considered as representing an embryonic form of Valentinian faith. On the other hand, it is remote from the full mythological development of later Valentinianism; therefore, we can place it in the middle of the road.

This chapter will discuss the problem of Valentinianism of the Gospel of Truth as a preliminary stepping stone to the view that Valentinus is the author of that work.

The Gospel of Truth and Gnosticism

There is a common agreement on the Gnostic character of the EV. Its general emphasis that salvation is possible only through knowledge is sufficient to make the writing a Gnostic document: the human soul is a particle of the divine substance which has fallen down into the world of matter and darkness and only by taking conscience of its divine origin can it fulfill its destiny; namely, it

can return to its heavenly home, the bosom of the divinity.

This fundamental emphasis on Knowledge is expressed in terms of basic Gnostic conceptions and of an extended Gnostic vocabulary.

The notion of God is in agreement with all we know about the unknown and unknowable God of Gnosticism. In the Gospel of Truth God is remote from the world, illimitable and inconceivable.[1] He is the source and the final destination of all that exists.[2] As the source of all things he is called the Father.[3] It is to be noticed, however, that the god of the EV is in control of the world, even though on a highest and rather eschatological plane, since nothing happens without his will.[4] This brings this notion of God closer to that of the creator and sustainer of the universe in John 1:3 and Matthew 10:29.

Not the human soul generally, but the soul of the Gnostic is capable of salvation which consists in its return to God to whom it is consubstantial. There is no clear distinction between the aeonic or divine beings in the heavenly places and the Gnostics upon earth because of the consubstantiality that exists among them. Both groups are of divine substance as "the members" of the Father,[5] both were

---

[1] EV 17. 7, 22; 18. 27-30, 32; 42. 8 seqq.

[2] EV 17. 5 seq.; 37. 38; 32. 2; 18. 34; 19. 7.

[3] EV 16. 33, 36; 17. 1, 10, 31; 18. 1, 2, 7, 15; 19. 3, 39, 32; 20. 1, 19, 27; 21. 1, 7, 9, 19, 30; 22. 28; 24. 7, 10, 15, 30, 31; 26. 30, 32, 35; 27. 6, 10, 19; 28. 12, 33; 30. 5, 33; 31. 11, 20; 33. 31, 33, 39; 34. 3, 14; 35. 11, 15; 36. 18, 34; 37. 2, 19, 24, 34, 38; 38. 7, 14, 22, 33, 37; 39. 24, 26, 28; 40. 7, 29; 41. 3-28; 42. 27; 43. 4, 7, 14, 23.

[4] EV 37. 19-23.

[5] EV 18. 40.

affected by the same ignorance of the Father[1] and "the all sought for him from whom it had come forth."[2] The spiritual men alone are capable of salvation, material men are "alien to him"[3] and similar to broken vessels[4] which are of no damage to their owner. These have no existence and they will never exist.[5] Participation in the elect group, however, is a matter of origin which determines the predestination of the elect.

Aeons and the Gnostics on earth are in ignorance and need salvation through knowledge. Ignorance is also known as lack and deficiency. Deficiency came forth because they did not know the Father. Once, however, they know the Father deficiency and ignorance automatically disappear.[6] It is also known as forgetfulness,[7] sleep, under the influence of which man is acting without knowledge,[8] and intoxication.[9]

The Spirit, represented by the above groups is captivated within the realm of forgetfulness, darkness and error[10] which corresponds to matter.[11]

It is the function of the Logos-Christ to rescue the imprisoned element from its bonds.[12] The descent of the Logos, therefore, is the descent of the Saviour[13] and this is the joyous message, the gospel of hope,[14] namely, the knowledge of the Father.[15] The death

---

[1] EV 17. 1. [2] EV 17. 5-6. [3] EV 31. 1.
[4] EV 25. 30. [5] EV 24. 22-23. [6] EV 24. 29-38.
[7] EV 18. 1. [8] EV 29. 35; 30. 9. [9] EV 22. 17.
[10] EV 17. 35; 18. 17; 31. 25. [11] EV 17. 15. [12] EV 31. 26.
[13] EV 16. 37. [14] EV 16. 31; 17. 30. [15] EV 16. 33.

Jesus is due to the anger of Error.[1] This death, however, made a fruit of knowledge of Him for those who ate it and cause of joy.[2] Jesus' death is like the opening of a will[3] and caused the opening of the book of the living which included the decree of the Father.[4]

This is a short sketch of the main Gnostic ideas which do not preclude the Valentinian character of the tractate.

The Gospel of Truth as a General Gnostic Work Only

The first editors of the Gospel of Truth without hesitation claimed that the EV belongs to a particular type of Gnosis known as Valentinianism. Referring to the Jung Codex which contains it, they affirmed that "les écrite qu'il renferme sont tous ... incontestablement issus d'une école gnostique spéciale, cèlle de Valentin."[5] They consider its Valentinian character beyond dispute.[6]

Van Unnik in 1955 further maintained that the Gospel of Truth should be attributed to Valentinus himself who wrote it in Rome on the eve of his rupture from the Christian community of Rome between 140-150 A.D.[7] The theory was suggested one year earlier.[8]

---

[1] EV 18. 22. [2] EV 18. 25-29. [3] EV 20. 15.

[4] EV 19. 34; 20. 26, 27.

[5] Puech, Quispel, and Malinine, p. xi. [6] Ibid., p. xii.

[7] Van Unnik, The Jung Codex, pp. 81-129.

[8] William Cornelis Van Unnik, "Het Kortgeleden ontdekte Evangelie der Waarheid en bet Niewe Testament," Mededelingen der Kominkliike Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenshappen, Afd. Letterkunde, No. 3 (Amsterdam: Nieuwe Reeks, December 17, 1954).

Hans Martin Schenke emphatically rejected this suggestion, arguing that the evidence produced by Van Unnik and the other editors was void of any convincing power. He insisted that far from being a work of Valentinus the EV was not Valentinian at all in character but should be classified as generally Gnostic belonging to the same school of thought as the Odes of Solomon.[1]

Due to the significance of this denial it is pertinent to examine the argument upon which Schenke bases his theory.

One of the arguments in favor of the Valentinian character of the Gospel of Truth is its terminology. The editors maintain that "le language et la doctrine mis an oeuvre par l'Evangile de Verite ressortissent, de toute évidence, au gnosticisme valentinien."[2]

Schenke repudiates altogether the power of this argument asserting that terms such as Aeon, the All, Pleroma, Deficiency, Place of Rest, Rest, Hylic, Those of the Center, appear also in other gnostic documents of which he gives parallels.[3] His conclusion, therefore, is that they do not prive any specific Valentinian affiliation of the Gospel of Truth. He, furthermore, compiles a list of important Valentinian terms known from accepted Valentinian documents which are conspicuously absent from the Gospel of Truth. Such are: the Thirty aeons, the Fall of Sophia, the Exopleromatic Sophia, the Demiurge and the Three classes of men.[4] Schenke identifies Valentinianism with the list of missing terms and ideas.

---

[1]Schenke, p. 28.

[2]Puech, Quispel, and Malinine, p. xii.

[3]Schenke, p. 20, n. 2.

[4]Ibid., p. 22.

The absence of these terms and notions is also recognized by the editors who stress the difference of the EV from other Valentinian systems: "l'auteur de l'ouvrage fait de certain termes communs au language de l'École ... un emploi singulier et ... ressaisie dans son ensemble la doctrine qu'il professe ne coincide avec aucun des divers systemes de valentinianisme que nous connaissons, fût-ce avec celui de son fondateur tel que le resument Irenee ... et le Pseudo-Tertullien...."[1]

Schenke, furthermore, contrasts the EV to certain fundamental Valentinian ideas. These are: the cause of the fall of the aeons,[2] the connection of the present world to Ignorance,[3] the character of Error or Plane,[4] and, above all, Christology.[5]

As far as the fall of the aeons is concerned, Schenke thinks that, while the EV places the fall in the Ignorance of the Father, the Valentinian documents put it in the passion of Sophia. In her search after the Father, Sophia did not realize that the Father was unknowable.

One could remark that Schenke overlooks the basic fact that even in the EV the Father is unknowable, that he makes himself known through the Son, and that, therefore, in either case Ignorance is the common denominator.

Schenke, furthermore, does not make clear whether Ignorance is the result of the fall or the fall the result of Ignorance. In

---

[1] Malinine, Puech, and Quispel, p. xiii.

[2] Schenke, p. 22.

[3] Ibid., p. 23.

[4] Ibid., p. 24.

[5] Ibid., p. 25.

the first case, we wish to learn what motivated the fall, in the second, the fall appears to be a perpetual situation related to the nature of the aeons. It seems probable that in either case the background is the same and that we are in the presence of a variation of the same idea and the matter should not be overpressed.

The second point of Schenke is the connection of the universe to Ignorance. EV presents the material world as the work of Error, but Error, again, is Error in connection to the Father. The Valentinian systems present the material world as a result of the passions of Sophia which, again, derived their existence from her Ignorance. In either case Ignorance is the ultimate source of this world, and I cannot see the reason why Schenke insists on secondary matters which do not result in major conclusions concerning the main point and this is the relationship of the EV to Valentinianism.

As for the theme of Error itself, Schenke stresses the fact that "Plane" for the EV is a person, while for Valentinianism it is a spiritual condition of a person.[1] H. Jonas turns this argument against those who maintain that the myth of Sophia is absent from the EV,[2] but, postponing this discussion for a later stage of this study, we mary remark against Schenke that in a system where passions consolidate into concrete matter, and qualities are personalized, it is idle to insist on such trivial distinctions: the erring person and error can easily be identified.

The last and, by no means, the least difference between the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 24.

[2] Jonas, Gnosis und spätantike Geist, p. 412.

EV and Valentinianism, as Schenke has rightly pointed out, is Christology. In the EV we have just one Christ or Logos; in Valentinianism we have three.[1] We might say that we have more if under the term "Christ" we will include all the figures which in the New Testament represent the Saviour in his preincarnation and incarnated stages of existence starting from the Monogenes and from Logos.

On the basis of the above premises, Schenke draws the final conclusion that in the Gospel of Truth there is nothing specifically Valentinian, that the teaching of the EV is incompatible with Valentinianism and that the origin of the EV is not Valentinian but generally Gnostic.[2] The EV also, he concludes, is equally foreign to such documents as the Apocryphon of John, the Sophia of Jesus Christ, and the systems recorded by Irenaeus.[3]

Some of Schenke's arguments have already been refuted here. It is necessary, however, to stress further that Schenke has overlooked certain essential aspects of the doctrine and terminology of the EV which seem to make evident that its author is not only a Gnostic in a general sense, but one who also agrees with the basic tenets of the Valentinian Gnosis.

The Gospel of Truth as a Valentinian Work

In contradistinction to Schenke's argument, there are scholars who have accepted the original suggestion of the first editors, and

---

[1] Schenke, p. 24.

[2] Ibid., p. 28.

[3] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 29, 30.

have tried to strengthen it with new arguments.

R. M. Grant in 1959, i.e., two years after the publication of the EV, observed strong resemblances between the speculations of the Roman writing of the Shepherd of Hermas and Valentinus' Gospel of Truth which, he believes, "is full of Jewish mystical speculation and lacks any explicit criticism of the Jews or of Jewish Christianity,"[1] and that Valentinus in it has reduced the role of apocalyptic eschatology, probably under the influence of the apocalyptic catastrophe under Hadrian.[2]

Before the third edition of Hans Jonas' Gnosis und Spätantiker Geist appeared in 1964 with its new chapter on the codices of Nag Hammâdi,[3] he also found that "behind the Gospel of Truth lies the doctrine of the aeons, of their fall, of their control of the world . . . the doctrine that the Gnostic is a being from on high."[4]

Hans Jonas discusses the Valentinian character of the Gospel at length.[5] He argues that the Gospel of Truth is a soteriological argument that relates the last things to their primordial counterparts, that there is a soteriological formula in Valentinianism and in the Gospel of Truth which constitutes the essence of the Valentinian system and that this basic formula is rooted in the Valentinian myth.

---

[1]Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 128.

[2]Ibid., p. 129.

[3]Jonas, Gnosis und Spätantiker Geist, pp. 408-418.

[4]Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 131.

[5]Jonas, Gnosis und Spätantiker Geist, pp. 408-418.

Jonas believes that the EV presents an unmistakable terminological and doctrinal agreement with the Valentinian theory. While by-passing, however, the discussion of isolated technical terms, which attracted the attention of the first editors and of Schenke, he grasps the problem from its soteriological side, which establishes the ground for the hope of salvation.

This hope is grounded upon a logical argument which occurs twice in the Gospel.[1] The same formula, however, occurs also once in Irenaeus i. 21. 4, a passage which according to him should not be confined to the description of the Marcosian sect.[2] Apart from its actual content, this logical scheme may be expressed as follows: "Since this is so . . . for that reason that is so, too."[3] This logical scheme is filled with considerations based on the beginning and the end of the world. Eschatology, however, is rooted in the primordial beginnings, and the link between the two is knowledge. Knowledge, on the other hand, should not be taken as a subjective psychological experience, but as an objective ontological factor.

This leads us to a key passage of the EV which offers the very definition of the joyful message of the Valentinian Gospel. This is EV 18. 7-11 which includes the first occurrence of the formula: "Since Forgetfulness came into existence because they did not know the Father, for that reason it immediately disappears when they came to the Knowledge of the Father."[5] Jonas believes that this

---

[1] EV 18. 7-11' 24. 28-32. See also Jonas, Gnosis und Spätantike Geist, pp. 410-11.

[2] Ibid., p. 416, n. 1. [3] Ibid., p. 409. [4] Ibid., p. 410.

[5] Cf. EV 24. 28-32.

is the core of the Gospel of Truth, namely, the message that Christ revealed to the world and also the logic of the soteriological scheme.[1]

The scheme itself is an independent stereotyped Valentinian formula that the EV as incorporated. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 21. 4 witnesses to that fact and every Valentinian contemporary to the author of the Gospel of Truth would be able to recognize it. Jonas had, in the first edition of his work in 1934, already stressed the significance of this formula without yet being in a position to know its formular character and apart, of course, from any reference to the Gospel of Truth.[2] This formula serves as a creed.

What is important is the fact that as it appears in Irenaeus, the creed is the clue to the discovery of the Valentinian myth. According to the EV the advent of Knowledge dissolves not only Ignorance and Forgetfulness (or Incompleteness or Lack) but also "Order," or "σύστασις." This "order" is the visible world considered not as "κόσμος," or a beautiful systematic universal order. The substances of the world, however, are the by-product of the passions of the fallen Sophia, and they themselves, in turn, are the result of Ignorance. Here we reach the crucial point of the whole theory.

If Ignorance results to the existing world, and Knowledge, on the other hand leads to its end, we are entitled to assume that the myth of Sophia lies behind the formula or Irenaeus, and also by

---

[1] Ibid., p. 410.

[2] Ibid., p. 411, n. 1.

implication, behind the two formulas of the EV. Thus, the whole Valentinian speculation on the Pleroma, the aeons, Sophia, the Demiurge and the material world are presupposed by the EV. The formula, in other words, is an evidence to the Valentinian character of the Gospel of Truth.

This general conclusion can be substantiated by detailed arguments based on certain allusions that our Gospel offers to certain basic Valentinian themes such as the myth of Sophia, the Valentinian Pleroma, the nature of the Logos, the three natures, and the doctrine of the divine "seed."

The Gospel of Truth and the Myth of Sophia

The myth of Sophia is not altogether absent from our document, but it cannot be easily identified without the help of Irenaeus.

EV 17. 5 - 18. 16 is a description of the primordial conditions of the world. It informs us on the search of the "All" for the Father,[1] and on the results of Ignorance. These are Terror and Fear. Terror condenses into fog. Error becomes strong and produces its own matter and, finally, fashions a "schema," a form which is our World.

This is the figure of Falsehood, an equivalence of Truth, a caricature of the Divine World. This imitation of Truth has been used by Error as a snare to beguile those of the Middle, or the divine aeons, but Ignorance and Forgetfulness (of the Father) are automatically removed when the Knowledge of the Father arrives (a formula).

Terror and Fear are conditions of a person, and this person is

---

[1] EV 17. 5. [2] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 1. 3.

Sophia. From Irenaeus we learn that the Ignorance of Sophia resulted in her passions which, finally became solidified into material substances.[1] These passions result in material substances like sorrow into tears, and this may have been the initial observation of the Valentinians. Clement of Alexandria, on the other hand, betraying in this a Stoic influence, speaks of one substance which if thinned out becomes the essence of the various ranks of the angelic hierarchy up to the Divine Logos, while, if condensed, becomes the essence of the dark demons, of the various degrees of purity of the human soul, of the human body and of the four material elements.

The EV does not mention Sophia by name, but refers to her passions and their material by-products. Error is, however, definitely a person in the EV and may have been selected by its author as a contrast to Truth since Λήθη and Ἀλήθεια in Greek constitute a wordplay. The Valentinians are flexible in equating one abstraction to another. Thus Ignorance of God easily may have been replaced by the Forgetfulness of God and Error.

Error performs the functions of the Valentinian Demiurge and fashions our World. It antagonizes the Saviour, Jesus Christ (EV 18. 22 seqq.) but He, in turn, fills the lack of God in Creation and abolishes "Form" or the world where he served under his capacity as Logos-Saviour.[2] The best parallel to this statement would be the Valentinian Fragment V: "τό ὄνομα ἐπλήρωσεν τό ὑστερῆσαν ἐν πλάσει."[3] The advent of the Logos is the advent to the Name to the world.[4]

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 1. 3. [2] EV 24. 19-24.

[3] Clement Alexandria, Strom. iv. 89. 6 - 90. 1.

[4] EV 38. 7 - 40. 3.

Thus far in the EV we have met four figures of the Valentinian myth: the Father, Sophia implicitly present in her passions, Error functioning as a worker, and the material world. There remains another entity, "the All," which was in search of the Father.

The All cannot be the figure of Falsehood, the material world, which by definition is equated to Ignorance and Forgetfulness. This figure is doomed to perdition. The All, on the contrary, is capable of salvation (cf. its search for the Father in EV 17. 5), therefore, the All, as in Valentinianism in general, represents the aeons in their totality, namely, the Pleroma. There are, however, more allusions to a full Pleroma, as we meet it in the system of Ptolemy.

Allusions to the Pleroma in the Gospel of Truth

The Gospel has no developed Pleroma with its partition into tetrads and Ogdoads. There are, however, in it allusions to some of the aeons of the classical grouping.

"The Gospel of Truth is a joy for those who have received the grace of knowing from the Father of Truth Him through the power of the Logos, come forth from the Pleroma, who is immanent in the Thought, and in the Mind (Νοῦς) of the Father."[1] In connection with the Pleroma we hear in this passage of Grace, Father of Truth, Λόγος , Thought, Mind and Joy. These terms present a striking parallel with OS xli 9-15.

Similarly we read in EV 37. 7-14: "when they were (still) in the depth (Βάθος)of His Mind, the Λόγος which was the first to come

---

[1] EV 16. 31-36.

forth, caused them to appear, joined to the Mind (Νοῦς) which pronounces the unique Λόγος in silent Grace (Χάρις) and which was called Thought, because they were in It before becoming manifest."

This passage refers to the emergence of the Logos and of the aeons from the Mind of the Father. Again we have a reference to Νοῦς, the Λόγος, Grace, Silence, Thought or Ἔννοια with the addition of Depth (Βάθος). The they refers to the aeons.

In the above two passages which both refer to the Divine Pleroma, we have the following figures: (1) the Father and Depth, (2) the Father's Thought or Ἔννοια known also as Grace and Silence, Χάρις and Σιγή, (3) the Father of Truth, (4) Truth, (5) Mind or Νοῦς and (6) Λόγος. These all correspond to the aeons of the first Ptolemaic Ogdoads where we also have (1) the Father or Βάθος, or Βυθός, or ABYSS, (2) Thought or Ἔννοια known also as Grace (Χάρις) and Silence (Σιγή), (3) Mind or Νοῦς, also known as Father of Truth, (4) Truth and (5) Λόγος.

There is no doubt that here we are faced by a definite allusion of the Gospel to the Valentinian Pleroma of Ptolemy and this constitutes another proof of the Valentinian character of our document.

The Gospel of Truth and the System of Ptolemy

We must not overlook, however, the differences that exist between the EV and Ptolemy. The function of the Logos in the EV is soteriological and the Ptolemaic classification of the aeons into syzygies is missing. This difference can be explained by the freedom of the Valentinians to group their aeons according to their indi-

vidual tastes.[1] Hans Jonas mentions seven different editions of the development of the Pleroma, namely, four in Irenaeus and the rest in Hippolytus, Epiphanius, and the Excerpta of Theodotus.[2]

Furthermore we also must account for the fundamental difference of opinion between Valentinus and his disciple Ptolemy referred to by Tertullian. Ptolemy was the first to conceive the aeons as personal entities, while Valentinus considered them as "sensus et affectus et motus" of God.[3] If Valentinus is the author of the EV we can explain the difference from Ptolemy on the basis of Tertullian's statement.

The existence of a Pleroma composed of several aeons can also be attested by an allusion of the Gospel that reminds the Ptolemaic doctrine of the emission of Christ by all the aeons in cooperation.[4]

On the basis of EV 23. 18-23, the emergence of the Logos occurs in the following manner: "His Wisdom (Σοφία) meditates (μελετᾷ) on the Logos. His Intelligence projects It; His Gnosis has been revealed . . . His Joy is mixed with It; His Glory It has revealed (and) His Image It has revealed; His Repose It has received within Itself; His Love ('Αγάπη) took bodily form (Σῶμα) around It; His faith encircled It."

In this passage the Procession of the Logos to the "All" is related to abstractions such as SOPHIA, Intelligence which is probably the NOUS, Gnosis, Joy, Glory and Love of the Father. All these

---

[1]Cf. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 18. 1.

[2]Jonas, Gnosis und Spätantike Geist, p. 362.

[3]Tertullian Adv. Valentin. 14.

[4]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 2. 6.

are involved in the process of the emergence of the Logos just as in Irenaeus i. 2. 4 where Christ is called the product and the contribution of All.

The names of the aeons is not important for reasons that have been stated already. The interplay of abstractions as qualities of the Father and their involvement in the production of the Logos is the important thing. These abstractions may be still fluid in the stage of development that the EV represents and Ptolemy may have fixed them later but the existence of some kind of aeonic group, or Pleroma, is the essential thing and this establishes a solid link between the Gospel of Truth and Valentinianism.

The Doctrine of the Three Natures

The Valentinian picture of the speculation that underlies the Gospel of Truth would be incomplete without a reference to the tripartite division of the Universe which is essential to Valentinianism. This is nothing else than the doctrine of the Three Natures, the Psychic or animal, the Spiritual or Pneumatic, and the Material or Hylic.

Säve-Söderbergh relates EV 33. 24-32 to Valentinian Baptism and distinguishes three kinds of people: the Lawless, the Just, and the Spiritual (Ἄνομοι, Δίκαιοι, Πνευματικοί). The latter, or the Spiritual, are addressed to by the words: "but . . . you."[1]

This classification of people into three classes corresponds to the Valentinian doctrine of the Three Natures which, according to

---

[1] EV 33. 31. See, also, Säve-Söderbergh, Religion och Bibel, XVII, 34-35.

Sagnard, is the essence of Valentinianism. His whole discussion is based on the three kinds of Law that Sagnard brings into relief on the basis of Valentinian sources.[1]

In his Letter to Flora, Ptolemy makes two divisions of the Law of God. In the first place he distinguishes three parts in the Law: the one derived from Moses, the other from the elders, and the third from God himself.[2]

To this major division Ptolemy makes a further subdivision of the Law of God. First, the Law of God is pure and altogether unmixed with evil. This is the law that the Savious came to perfect. Secondly, there is a law which is mingled with the lower element and injustice. That kind of law was contrary to the nature of the Saviour and, as a consequence, it was abolished by Him. Finally, the Law is figurative, symbolic and reflecting higher spiritual realities. The Saviour transposed this law from the realm of the sensible and visible to that of the spiritual and invisible.

The god who gave this law that Ptolemy divides into three parts is a god of Justice. His main law, the Decalogue, is just and pure, and even his "mixed" law is just. He is, however, an imperfect god, since his best production--the Decalogue--needs completion by the Saviour. This god is not the "Perfect God." He is not the Devil either, therefore, he stands between the two; he is an intermediary god.

---

[1]Sagnard, Études de Philosophie Médiévale, XXXVI, 460, 469-70, 474-75.

[2]Epiphanius Panarion 33.5.

That conclusion of the Letter of Ptolemy to Flora leads directly to the doctrine of the three natures or substances in Valentinianism, as it does, in "the Grande Notice" of Irenaeus. The "Good" substance belongs to the "Perfect Father"; the evil, to the Devil, while the Just, which is imperfect and figurative only of the Good, belongs to the Demiurge, the maker of this world. The nature of the Adversary who is the Devil is unjust and evil.

The Gospel of Truth, by making a tripartite distinction between the lawless, the just and spiritual simply reproduces the distinction made by Ptolemy to Flora when he refers to the unjust, the just and the good. This is, therefore, nothing else than the Valentinian doctrine of the Three Natures, i.e., the material, the Psychic or intermediate, and the spiritual.

In the same connection the EV text makes a distinction between the cold fragrance and the hot. The former corresponds to Baptism administered by the Church. It is called "Psychic"[1] and the term appears once only in the EV in order to distinguish the cold water or first fragrance from the hot unction of the Spirit.[2] Christ was called in their midst (of the Valentinians) to, "anoint them with Unction."[3]

The emphasis on the Pneumatic element leads us naturally to the description of the Valentinians as the "seed" of the Father. This is another of the constituent elements of the Valentinian doctrine. Thus we are informed that the true brothers who should be distinguished from the untrue brothers or the "Psychic" members of the

---

[1] EV 34. 10. [2] EV 33. 26. [3] EV 36. 13.

Catholic Church, are filled with the "seed of the Father."[1]

In addition to the above-mentioned arguments that favor the view that the EV is a Valentinian document we can produce here two more Valentinian formulas and also a comparison between the fragments of Valentinus and our tractate.

The Gospel of Truth and Two More Valentinian Formulas

Irenaeus i. 21. 5 preserved a Valentinian formula that the deceased Valentinian was advised to use in order to escape the powers of the demiurge: "I am a vessel more precious than the female who formed you." The word vessel (σκεῦος) occurs four times in EV 24. 25-35 and denotes the Valentinian who is filled with perfection (Spirit?), the hylic man who is doomed to destruction, and the aeons who were disturbed upon the descent of the Logos. The Valentinian of Irenaeus, as a "precious vessel," corresponds to the vessels that were filled with perfection in the Gospel of Truth. The term and the idea of both cases are Valentinian.[2]

The most famous Valentinian formula that links together the Gospel and the Excerpta of Theodotus and, therefore, Valentinianism in connection with Baptism here, is Excerptum 78. 2: "τίνες ἦμεν, τί γεγόναμεν, ποῦ ἦμεν, ποῦ ἐνεβλήθημεν· ποῦ σπεύδομεν, πόθεν λυτρούμεθα· τί γέννησις, τί ἀναγέννησις." This is the content of the spiritual Knowledge and Irenaeus i. 21. 4 connects it both to the

---

[1] EV 43. 14.

[2] Segelberg (Orientalia Suecana, VIII, 41) relates this formula to chrism and considers it liturgical.

Valentinian formula mentioned by Jonas and also to the sacrament of ἈΠολύτρωσις.

EV 22. 13-15 gives us an abridgement of the formula again in connection with the content of Gnosis: "He who thus possesses the Gnosis, knows whence he is come and where he is going."

The content of this Knowledge that the formula puts in the form of a question is well known. The Valentinian came to this world as a parcel of the divine Sophia. His place of origin as well of destination is the Father or the Pleroma, therefore he is expected to awaken from sleep and rediscover himself: "It was a great marvel that they[1] were in the Father without knowing Him, and that they escape by their own volition."[2] The Valentinian Gnostic who knows his origin and destiny us a "person who, having been intoxicated, becomes sober and having come to himself, reaffirms that which is essentially his own."[3]

By implication this doctrine of the rediscovery of the self includes the notion of Valentinian predestination of the elect, the rejection of the non-elect and the division of mankind into classes. Later we shall see that the three natures or kinds of men--the pneumatic, the psychic or animal, and the material--are included in this creed. It also includes the doctrine of the Sperma or of the Pneumatic "Seed."

---

[1]The aeons in the world above and the Valentinians on earth who are aeons within human bodies.

[2]EV 22. 27-30.

[3]EV 22. 16-19.

The Gospel of Truth and the Valentinian Fragments

A comparison between the Gospel of Truth and the few surviving fragments of Valentinus would further prove not only the Valentinian character of our tractate but more than that: its Valentinian authorship that this study has maintained on the basis of the psychology and cosmogony of the author of the Gospel of Truth and of Valentinus.

Enough has been said on Fragment I of Valentinus which has one common element with the Gospel of Truth, i.e., the element of fear or fears which is common to angels and men.

Fragment II stresses the Goodness of the Father. An important Valentinian feature of our Gospel is the emphasis on the "Goodness" of God. EV 33. 34[1] states: "The Father is kind, and His Will is that which is good"; EV 36. 34: The Father ". . . is good"; EV 42. 30: The Father ". . . that truly Good One"; EV 33. 33 refers to the goodness of His Will. In the same connection we may also mention the kindness and gentleness of the Father. For EV 33. 33 Schenke has "Süss" and for EV 31. 19 "Süssigkeit." For EV 33. 33 Ménard has "sweetness," γλυκύτης ; while Grobel has "kindness." The "Goodness" of the Father, however, is one of the theological emphases of Valentinus. In Fragment II, God is called "the only Good Father," "εἷς δέ ἐστιν ἀγαθός...ὁ μόνος ἀγαθός πατήρ."

This agreement brings the Gospel into immediate closeness with one of the Valentinian fragments of which Clement says that he preserves "the very words."

---

[1]Grobel's translation.

[2]Clement Alexandria, Strom. ii. 114. 3-6. [3]Ibid., iii. 59. 3.

Fragment III[1] states that, "τοσαύτη ἦν αὐτῷ (τῷ Ἰησοῦ) ἐγκρατείας δύναμις, ὥστε καί μή φθαρῆναι τήν τροφήν ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐπεί τό φθείρεσθαι αὐτός οὐκ εἶχε." The Gospel of Truth stresses the incorruptibility of the body of Jesus even before the Resurrection: "He abases himself even unto death though clothed already with immortal life."[2]

Fragment V has already been referred to above in connection with the filling of the lack by the name. We have seen how the Logos-Name has filled Deficiency in the world.

In Fragment VI we have another parallel between Valentinus and the EV, where the Son is twice called "Beloved."[3] Clement of Alexandria has preserved a fragment of Valentinus on the theme of friendship which is common to secular literature and to the Church of God" and refers to the law which is written in the heart of the people who is "the people of the Beloved One who is loved by him and loves him."[4]

We do not know whether this refers to the Father or to the Son. The term "Beloved," however, as applied to Christ, was widespread in early Christianity. The general Christian use does not minimize the significance of the occurrence of this Messianic title in Valentinus and in the EV. Most of the specific Valentinian terms are of Christian provenance; their particular use, however, by Valentinus and his followers incorporates them in the Valentinian vocabulary. If, therefore, such a term as the "Beloved" occurs in two

---

[1] Ibid., iii. 59. 3.

[2] EV 20. 29-30.

[3] EV 30. 31; 40. 24.

[4] Clement Alex. Strom. vi. 52. 3-4.

Valentinian writers it is legitimate to establish a connection between them than to explain it in terms of general Christianity.[1]

As last but not as least, Fragment VIII should be mentioned which has given us a sample of Valentinus' poetry and also a summary of the latter's doctrine. It has been preserved by Hippolytus, who sees in it a summary of Valentinus' philosophy on the structure of the universe: "δι᾽ἐλαχίστων Οὐαλεντῖνος ἐν ψαλμῷ" of the "διαταγή" or the order of the world.[2] Hippolytus' interpretation of the poem is important because he knew its use by the Valentinians and that use, again, was based on the meaning Valentinus attached originally to it.

A. J. Festugière reviews the problems that are related to that small psalm which refers to the doctrine of the "chains."[3]

The doctrine of the "chains" was a common theme in the second century A.D. and Hippolytus remarks that the psalm starts the chain of beings not from the top, as in Plato,[4] but from the bottom and explains the meaning of each link. Thus, flesh is matter, the soul is the demiurge, air is exopleromatic Sophia, while air itself hangs from ether which is Sophia within the Pleroma.

Festugière remarks that verses 1-5 are a common Hellenistic theme and refers to sources such as CH xi. 2 seqq. on θεός, αἰών,

---

[1]Cf. above, p. 55, where Fragment VI has already been referred to in connection with the style of the Gospel of Truth and the homiletical fragments of Valentinus.

[2]Hippolytus, Refutatio vi. 37. 6-8.

[3]Festugière, Vigiliae Christianae, III, No. 4, 193-207.

[4]Plato, Ep. ii. 312 seq.

κόσμος,χρόνος,γένεσις ; CH xi. 15 on θεός,αἰών,κόσμος,ἥλιος,ἄνθρωπος and others. He attributes the ideas of verses 6-7 to Valentinus himself, since they refer to the Bythos and the aeons.[1] Hippolytus actually identifies Bythos with the Father and the "fruits" with the aeons.

Whatever the origin and use of the doctrine of the chains might be, Valentinus' intention is to express through it his whole theory of the universe correctly starting from the bottom and ending with the Father from whom all things actually hang. The reverse order of the chain is intentional, since Valentinus wants to give us an explanation of the universe in terms of a single line starting from matter and ending with the Father. For Plato, matter is eternal, therefore, it cannot derive its existence from God who, as a creator, is a simple artisan. Hippolytus, who observed the difference of Valentinus from Plato, explains the Valentinian chain in terms of Valentinian doctrine and not in general hellenistic terms. Thus we have the following sequence: matter, the psychic demiurge, exopleromatic Sophia, Sophia within the Pleroma, the aeons and finally, the Father.

Hippolytus' interpretation makes the Harvest a review of Valentinian doctrine, a kind of Valentinian creed. As such, it includes all that is essential to Valentinianism, namely, the monistic interpretation of the world hanging from one single source, the Father, and the differentiation of reality in terms of the doctrine of the three natures: matter, the psychic nature of the demiurge,

---

[1]Festugière, Vigiliae Christianae, III, No. 4, 206.

and the pneumatic nature of Sophia which is the source of the demiurge. It also includes the doctrine of the Trinity, since the βρέφος of verse 7 of Fragment VIII can easily be identified to παῖς νήπιος of Fragment VII and therefore to the Logos, while the matrix of verse 7 of Fragment VIII is nothing else than the Holy Spirit, or the κάλπος of EV 24. 9.

Thus Fragment VIII is another witness to the doctrine that we have detected in the Gospel of Truth. It agrees with that document in the monistic interpretation of reality from one single source, in the derivation of matter from the spirit, and in the doctrine of the Trinity.

A comparison between the homiletical fragments of Valentinus and the Gospel of Truth has shown stylistic similarities between the two documents (see above, p. 55).

These parallels between the EV and the fragments of Valentinus are of special significance. They have a heavier bearing upon our problem than any parallel that may be established between the EV and, let us say, Ptolemy or Theodotus.

The foregoing arguments are sufficient to prove the Valentinian character of the Gospel of Truth. Schenke's view is not based on a true interpretation of certain facts. The truth lies in the direction of those who believe that the second document of the Jung Codex is a product of the Valentinian school as the first editors had pointed out.

The Gospel of Truth Within the Process of Valentinian Development

The conclusion that the Gospel of Truth is Valentinian needs clarification. We know from later Valentinian sources, such as Pistis Sophia and from the sources of Epiphanius that Valentinianism underwent a process of evolution becoming more and more mythological. In view of this development what may be the place of the EV in the whole Valentinian process?

Those who hold to the Valentinian nature of our Gospel do not agree on this important point. Some consider our Gospel as representing an embryonic form of Valentinianism which has not yet developed its mythology. To this group belong the editors themselves, R. Grant, and others. Others, like Helmer Ringgren accept for the EV an advanced form of Valentinianism but still a form which has not yet reached its full development. Finally, there are scholars, like H. Jonas, who believe that the EV is the expression of the complete Valentinian system, as it is known to us from the traditional Valentinian sources.

R. M. Grant accepts a development of Valentinianism that he attributes to Valentinus himself. He believes that out of the two accounts of Irenaeus, the one ignores the notion of the syzygy and speaks of one "Perfect Father," who is at the same time Depth and Father, not Depth and Silence.[1] According to the same Irenaeus, the creator of the world is the product of the passions of Sophia. The EV has no creator but a personified abstraction that it calls Error.

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 1. 1 - ii. 2. 2.

Error is the agent of creation. Grant suggests that this is the starting point of Valentinian mythology. For the mythological development Valentinus himself may be responsible, passing from abstraction into myth.[1]

Jonas is consistent to his premises that the Valentinian formula included the myth, and that this myth was fully developed. We must admit, however, that the formula does not enlighten us as to the degree of development of the myth. Was that myth similar to that of Pistis Sophia or to that of Ptolemy? Jonas does not answer the question.

The author feels that the middle road is safer on that matter. As H. Ringgren has suggested, the EV is a homeletic utilization of a ready system.[2]

This view on the type of Valentinianism of the EV is quite different from the assumption of the first editors who suggested the theory of proto-Valentinianism prior to the development of the system of the aeons.

It further makes meaningful the many allusions to and interpretations of a presupposed system that is transparent through the lines of the EV. This system, however, he thinks is much simpler than that which the ecclesiastical writers describe.

Related to this question is E. Segelberg's view on the liturgical allusions of the Gospel of Truth. If the EV presupposes a fully developed sacramental system then its doctrine must be well advanced too.

---

[1]Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 136.

[2]Ringgren, Religion och Bibel, XVII, 42, 44.

The above considerations touch on the heart of Valentinianism. They refer to Valentinian theology, the "All" or Pleroma, and its estrangement from the Father through Ignorance.

In the cosmological significance of Ignorance as the ultimate source of the visible world, and in the abolition of Ignorance and the annihilation of the whole world through Knowledge, Valentinian dualism reaches its apex. The Gospel teaches not a mere fall of the spiritual element into a material world which already existed but a falling away of the Divine substance itself which is the efficient cause and the condition of the existence of this world. The material world is the ultimate stage of degradation of the Divine substance which needs redemption through Knowledge also.

These considerations alone suffice to definitely stamp the Gospel of Truth as a Valentinian work and, therefore, as a primary source of Valentinian information. As such it is superior to all other Valentinian sources which have come to us through Patristic channels and in a fragmentary way. In the Gospel of Truth we do have first-hand information in the form of a complete work composed, as the writer believes, by Valentinus the founder of the school.

CHAPTER VII

THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND THE ODES OF SOLOMON

We have so far reached the conclusion that the Gospel of Truth is a Valentinian document, i.e., that it agrees with Valentinian doctrine and that, in turn, it can be used as a primary source for information on Valentinianism.

This conclusion contradicts Schenke's position that the Gospel is not a product of the Valentinian school and that its home should be sought rather in the Gnostic environment which produced the Odes of Solomon.

While disagreeing with Schenke on the non-Valentinian character of the tractate the writer accepts his view that there exists a series of essential similarities between the two documents. The two positions that the two documents are similar and that the one of them is Valentinian are not contradictory for the simple fact that both can be brought into a positive relationship to Valentinianism, the one being a thorough-going Valentinian work, the other standing on the borderline between Valentinianism and the Orthodoxy of the time.

This proximity of the Odes to Orthodoxy, which from another point of view is a proximity to Gnosticism, have been explained in various ways. Either the hymnal is the work of a former Valentinian, let us sau, Bardaisan, or it is the work of Valentinus himself before

his lapse into heresy. Independent of the problem of authorship, the Odes have a place in Early Christian literature and even in some lists of canonical books of the Early Church. The difference in temperament between the author of the Odes and Valentinus prevents us from considering the latter as their author.

The Similarities between the Two Documents

Robert Grant was the first to suggest that the Gospel of Truth and the Odes of Solomon are both Valentinian works and both represent the same stage of the development of that school.[1] He based his statement on some similarities that he observed between Odes 23 and 38 and the newly discovered treatise.

Ode 23 places emphasis on Joy, Grace, and Knowledge in a way that is similar to EV 16. 31. The same Ode has a pronounced statement on the Holy Trinity. The Gospel of Truth refers to the Trinity also. Here we have the Father, the Son who is the Name of the Father (EV 38. 7) and the Holy Spirit as the Father's Tongue (EV 26. 36).

Ode 38 presents an antagonism between Error and Truth. Truth became a haven of salvation to the Odist. The Truth-Error dualism is, on the other hand, a main theme in the Gospel of Truth.

On the basis of these similarities and other features of the Odes, Grant drew the conclusion that the two documents belong to the same school of thought. E. Preuschen, H. Gunkel, H. Gressman, Newbolt, and Stölten had early in our century identified the Odes of Solomon as a Gnostic and a Valentinian tractate.

---

[1]Robert M. Grant, "Notes on Gnosis," Virgiliae Christianae, XI (1957), 145 seq.

Hans Martin Schenke, two years after Grant's short but suggestive article, adopted the idea of affinity between the two documents, but reversed altogether the method of interpretation.[1] Schenke rejects entirely the Valentinian affiliation of the Gospel of Truth and considers the Odes as the necessary background against which we must project the former. His notion is that the Odes are non-Valentinian, but definitely Gnostic.

Since the problem put by Grant and Schenke is of major importance for the interpretation of the new document it is necessary to follow the argument in some detail.

Schenke enumerates the similarities that exist between the two documents and classifies them into three categories: (1) "Centralgedanken"; (2) mere points of agreement; and (3) affinities in "Wortwahl und Bildegebrauch." The latter can be found scattered in the footnotes of his translation and commentary.[2]

Reviewing these similarities between the two documents we discover the following situation:

1. The Nothingness of the World. EV 17. 18-25 states: "The creature of Falsehood that Plane modeled as the equivalent of Truth." To this corresponds OS xxxiv. 4 seq. which informs us that "the likeness of that which is below is that which is above; for everything is from above, and below there is nothing, but it is believed to be by the ignorant."

The material world for both documents is a reflection of the world above and actually it is nothing.

---

[1] Schenke, pp. 26-32.

[2] Ibid., pp. 26-29.

2. Error is a person that opposes God and his reality. In the Gospel of Truth, Error is the originator of matter, and of the world as a creature of Falsehood and annihilated Christ.[1] As an agent of creation and an opponent of Christ, Error is definitely a person.

The OS give us the same picture: "The abysses dissolved before the Lord; and darkness was destroyed by His appearance. Error went astray and disappeared from Him, and Wickedness gave to it no path, and it was submerged by the truth of the Lord."[2] Error here as a personal being antagonizes God and Truth and is related to the "abysses," darkness and wickedness.

The dualism becomes more intense when we hear that "neither God knows Error nor Error God."[3]

Furthermore Error appears as the consort of the Deceiver: Error and the Deceiver appear as a couple in OS xxxviii just as much as God and Truth appear as another couple in EV. The Odist sees this couple on his way to the heights on the chariot of Truth.[4]

3. In the same Ode--xxxviii. 12--we have the motif of drunkenness as we have it in EV 22. 16-20.

4. Both in the EV and in the OS the knowledge that saves is the Knowledge of God as Creator and Father. EV 24. 11-18 speaks of the compassion of the Father who makes himself known to the aeons. OS vii. 12 says: "He [the Father of the worlds] hath given him to appear to them that are His; that they may recognize Him that made

---

[1] EV 17. 15; 17. 25; 18. 20.

[2] OS xxxi. 1 seq.

[3] OS xviii. 10.

[4] OS xxxviii. 6-14.

them; and that they might not suppose that they came of themselves.[1] Schenke has not recognized here the Valentinian motif of the self-sufficiency of the aeons and of the demiurge who in Valentinianism and in other Gnostic sources boasts as the supreme god.

5. In both the Gospel of Truth and the Odes of Solomon emphasis is laid upon the crucifixion of Jesus without, however, any comment on the soteriological explanation of the meaning of the Cross. In both documents salvation is achieved through the Knowledge that the Saviour brings to the world. EV 18. 24 and 20. 25 say that he was nailed on a cross of wood; OS xxvii. 1; xxxv. 7; xxxvii. 1; and xli. 1, speak of the stretching out of the hands as Christ's sign. This is an allusion to the crucifixion of Jesus which by its nature is a problem in itself and will be discussed in connection with the question of Doceticism.

6. The most important Christological agreement between the Gospel and the Odes is the unity of Christ. I have shown elsewhere that in the Gospel of Truth there is just one Christ. OS xli, 15, answering probably to an opposite point of view, asserts that "The Messiah in truth is one." Clement as against Theodotus also stresses the unity of Christ.

This one Messiah[2] is the Word of God[3] who is "with us in all our way";[4] he is the man who was humbled,[5] and was exalted[6] by his own

---

[1] Cf. also OS vi. 6; vii. 21; viii. 8; xii. 13; xii. 10.

[2] OS ix. 3; xvii. 16; xxiv. 1; xxix. 6; xxxix. 11. 11; xli. 15.

[3] OS vii. 7; xii. 3. 5; x. 12; xvi. 7, 8, 14, 19; xxxvii. 3.

[4] OS xli. 11. [5] OS xli. 12. [6] OS xli. 12.

righteousness.[1] These statements assert Christ both as Logos and as man. He is the Son of the Most High[2] who was known "before the foundations of the world."[3] Finally he is the Saviour.[4]

7. The Father is the perfection of the aeons who allowed them to exist separately: the Father "produced the All . . . He retained in Himself their Perfection . . . in order that they should return to Him."[5]

In OS vii. 11 the incorrupt Father "is the Perfection of the worlds and the Father of them." "The Most High hath given Him (Christ) to His worlds. They are the interpreters of His beauty, and the reciters of His praise, and the confessors of His thought, and the heralds of His mind, and the instructors of His works for the Word is inexpressible: and like its utterance, so is its swiftness and sharpness."[6] The optimistic tone of this passage reminds us of Psalm 18:1-12. It is to be noted that the worlds acquire such a capacity after the descent of the Logos. The relationship of Word and worlds is significant. In the Gospel of Truth the withheld perfection probably refers to the period when the Logos had not yet descended as Saviour of the All.

The Word is the cause of the speech of the formerly silent worlds,[7] which means that the worlds become words. The worlds actually are the creation of the Word: The worlds were made by His Word, and by the thought of His heart.[8]

---

[1] OS xli. 12. [2] OS xli. 13. [3] OS xli. 15.
[4] OS xli. 15. [5] EV 18. 34 - 19. 5. [6] OS xii. 4-5.

The Word is also the Saviour of the worlds.[1]

8. There is a correspondence between the "Sanctuary" of the Father and the "places" or hosts and elect archangels.[2] This is equivalent to the Pleroma and the pleromas in the EV.

9. There is a contrast between the two groups of men who either belong to God and are "his own" and the enemies of God who are doomed to perish. In the Gospel of Truth apparently two categories of men are mentioned even though a third one is understood.

10. The major parallel between the two documents is the doctrine of the Trinity. OS xxiii explicitly states that upon the letter from heaven there was written the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. The Gospel of Truth equates the Son to the Name of the Father.[3] In EV 26. 34-36 we have the Father, the Father's mouth or Truth, and the Father's tongue or the Holy Spirit. In other words the unknown and unknowable God manifests himself through the Logos who is uttered through the cooperation of the Spirit.

There is an abundance of parallels between the Odes and the Gospel of Truth which means community of vocabulary and ideas. Some of them are indeed striking. Only some are produced here as illustrations to the above statement.

EV 16. 31 - 17. 1	OS xli. 9-15
The Gospel of Truth is joy for those who have received the grace of knowing	For the Father of Truth remembered me;/He who possessed me from the beginning./For his pleni-

[1] OS vii. 16[a]; xii. 4[a], 8-11.

[2] OS iv. 4. 8.

[3] EV 38-40.

from the Father of Truth Him
through the power of the Logos,
come forth from the Pleroma
who is immanent in the Thought
and in the Mind of the Father
who is He whom they call the
Saviour
for that is the name of the work
which he is to accomplish
for the salvation of those
who were ignorant of the Father

tude begat me,/And the thought of
His Heart:/And His Word is with
us in all our way,/The Saviour
who makes alive/and does not re-
ject our souls:/The man who was
humbled,/And was exalted by His
own righteousness;/The Son of
the Most High appeared/in the
perfection of His Father;/And
light dawned from the Word/That
was beforetime in Him;

Here we have the common terms: Father of Truth, Logos, Saviour, Pleroma-plenitude; Thought of His heart equivalent to Thought and Mind.

The Ode speaks of the humiliation of the Logos. EV 17. 21 uses the term in connection with the Father and EV 17. 24-25 speaks of the annihilation of the Logos. EV 17. 27 mentions the perfect beauty of Truth and 18. 36 of the retained perfection of the aeons. In the Gospel all these are not in the same passage but in the same context.

EV 16. 31 includes terms which appear in Ode xxiii. These are joy, grace of knowing, corresponding to the joy, grace, and knowledge of the Ode. The parallels can be multiplied and they show that the author of the EV knew and used the Odes.[1]

The Place of the Odes of Solomon in Early Christian Literature

The existing similarities between the Gospel of Truth and the Odes of Solomon raised, as said, the problem of the relationship between the writings. They cannot be attributed to chance. It is

---

[1]Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, pp. 132-34. See also F. M. Braun, "L'énigme des Odes de Salomon," Revue Thomiste, LVII, No. 4 (October-December, 1957), 609-11.

very probable that the one author knew and used the other. We cannot attribute the two writings, on the other hand, to the same author because of the serious differences that exist between the two. A third solution was suggested by Schenke who tried at the same time to fix the position of the Odes in early Church life and in its literature.

On the basis of the affinities between the two writings, Schenke concluded that, "Das sogenannte Evangelium Veritatis entstamt einem gnostischen Kreise, dem auch der Verfasser der Od. Sol. angehört."[1]

Due to the fact, however, that he considers this circle diametrically opposed to the thought of Valentinus and of his school, he presents to his opponents, under whom he understands the editors of the EV, the following dilemma: "Wenn die Herausgeber des sog. EV die These vom valentinianischen Ursprung nicht aufgeben wollen, dann werden sie die Theorie Preuschens ubernehmen müssen, dass die Od. Sol. von Valentinus herrühren."[2] R. Grant, two years before the publication of Schenke's book, maintained: "what Newbolt applies to Bardaisan suits the early Valentinus just as well."[3] Accordingly, Valentinus would be the author of the Odes of Solomon.

There are unquestionable similarities between the Odes of Solomon and the Gospel of Truth. The dilemma, "either . . . on the side of the Odes of Solomon or of Valentinus and Valentinianism," is not sound in its application to the EV. The similarities are a fact and this fact does not exclude the Valentinian character of both documents.

---

[1]Schenke, p. 29. [2]Ibid., p. 29, n. 31.

[3]Grant, Vigiliae Christianae, XI, 149, n. 21.

The fact that the Bardaisan hypothesis is still maintained fifty years after Newbolt for the first time in 1911[1] suggested it as a solution of the problem of authorship of the Odes shows clearly that the Valentinian character of the Odes is still seriously considered. R. M. Grant is convinced of it.[2]

Fr. F. M. Braun, O.P., in an article that appeared in the Revue Thomiste, in 1957 under the title "L'Énigme des Odes de Salomon," examines again the problem of the Odes in the light of the new data that we now possess, namely, the Hôdâyôt, or the Thanksgiving Hymns of the Dead Sea found in 1947 in Cave I of Qumran, and the Gospel of Truth.[3] R. M. Grant made the suggestion of the comparison between the Hôdâyôt and the Odes in 1957.[4]

Braun is aware of the affinities between the Gospel and the Odes and concludes that there is no literary dependence of the Gospel upon the Odes, since, according to him, the Gospel is earlier. There is no literary dependence of the Odes upon the Gospel either, but he believes that the Pseudo-Solomon "était au courant du vocabulaire et des thémes litteraires de la Gnose valentinienne."[5]

In the case of John, Braun believes that the Odist knew John and was inspired by him. He does not explain, however, why the Odist

---

[1]William Newbold, "Bardaisan and the Odes of Solomon," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXX, Part 2 (1911), 161-204.

[2]Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 134.

[3]Braun, Revue Thomiste, LVII, 597-625.

[4]Grant, Vigiliae Christianae, XI, 151, n. 24.

[5]Braun, Revue Thomiste, LVII, 611.

never quotes the fourth Gospel. Similarly, he accepts a late date for the OS but he rejects any literary dependence upon the Gospel of Truth. The Odist must have been an enemy of literary sources which he makes the source of his inspiration, as in the case of John, but never quotes.

Braun finds, however, serious differences between the Odes and the Gospel of Truth. Not only an elaborate system of aeons and the figure of the demiurge are missing from the Odes, but the very notion of knowledge is different. For Theodotus and the Gospel, Gnosis consists of the knowledge of the place of our origin which is also the place of our destiny. This is altogether absent from the Odes, as well as the doctrines of the three natures, of predestination, of the salvation by nature of the elect and the perdition by nature of the material man, of grace as a natural condition which does not require effort, of the discovery of the self, etc.[1]

The Odist, while using Valentinian vocabulary, breathes another atmosphere. His outlook is quite universalistic, embracing all men without the Valentinian distinctions. His presupposition is the unity of God and the brotherhood of all men. His notion of illumination is not the discovery of the self but of Christ and of the Father. On the other hand his notion of faith is not independent from love. His outlook is rather Johannine.

Braun offers a solution to the problem both of the similarities and of the differences between the Odes and the Gospel of Truth. The Valentinianism of the Odes is explained by the fact that their

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 619-24.

author is a former Valentinian. The differences from Valentinianism are also explained by the fact that the author is no longer a Valentinian but a man who rejected his former creed. This man is none other than Bardaisan.

The theory of Bardaisan is not new. As mentioned above, Newbold already in 1911 suggested it claiming for Bardaisan the authorship of the Odes of Solomon.[1] J. H. Bernard followed in 1913,[2] and then Martin Sprenging in 1918 and 1948 before Braun adopted the theory once more recently. Sprenging believes, "is it not more probable that we have here, as in the Laws of the Countries, sometimes called The Dialogue on Fate, the more innocuous, less definitely hereticized and hereticizable work of Bardaisan? These may be his earlier work, exhibiting the joy and enthusiasm of the recent convert."[3]

It is true that Bardaisan knew and used the Odes and this explains the similarities between him and the Odes. He was, also, a former Valentinian, and the Odes stand on the borderline between Valentinianism and Orthodoxy. Both the author of the Gospel of Truth and Bardaisan are familiar with the Odes. But to reverse the problem and explain the Valentinian elements of the Odes on the basis of Bardaisanian authorship is to ignore the difficulties involved in the problem of the date of the Odes.

The Bardaisan hypothesis might well be related to a flood which destroyed Edessa in 201 A.D. J. DeZwaan of Leyden, in a chap-

---

[1] Above, p. 189. [2] Above, p. 137.

[3] Quoted in M. Maryoship, The Oldest Christian Hymn-Book (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), pp. vi-vii.

ter of a book presented to K. Lake by his friends, relates this flood to OS vi. 8 seqq., which also mentions a flood that swept away everything and carried away the Temple. From this he argues that the Odes were written late in the second century A.D.[1] He does not relate the Odes to Bardaisan, however.

R. Harris, in his first edition of the Odes of Solomon, was tempted by the idea of relating the date of the composition of the Odes to the flood, but he gave up the idea in favor of the view that the flood refers to disasters generally, possibly with reference to Isaiah xliii:2 and the miracle of Jesus walking on the sea of Galilee.[2]

For those who accept the Bardaisanian authorship of the Odes, the problem of the date of the latter has been solved. For them the Odes were written by the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. This solution, however, is contradicted by internal and external evidence.

The early Wisdom Christology of the Odes, the paucity of New Testament references, the familiarity with Johannine ideas without any actual reference to the Johannine writings, the spontaneous inspiration of the author who shares the experience of the earlier generations of Christians are arguments against a late date.

On the other hand, there is sufficient external evidence for the antiquity of the Odes. Lactantius[3] incorporates a passage from a

---

[1]Maryoship, p. 15.

[2]Rendel J. Harris, The Odes and Psalms of Solomon (Cambridge: The University Press, 1909), pp. 134-35.

[3]Lactantius De Div. Instit. iv. 12.

text taken from a Testimony Book against the Jews which quotes Ode xix. Lactantius even preserves the serial number of the Ode. R. Harris maintains that the Testimony Book in its earliest form antedates the New Testament and is of Apostolic origin.[1] That means that Lactantius learned from his source of the existence of the whole collection of the Odes which had the same serial order. This establishes the date of the Odes in the first half of the second century A.D., if not earlier.

Lactantius' quotation proves that as early as the first half of the second century A.D. the Odes could be quoted as a work of Solomon and as a part of the Old Testament Canon.[2] A book, however, which succeeded to secure canonical status during the first half of the second century must have been written much earlier.

The canonical status of the Odes is also confirmed by the Sahidic Bible before the end of the third century.[3] This Bible was used by the Pistis Sophia, a late third-century collection of earlier Gnostic sources. The latter takes its Sahidic text for the five Odes it quotes from this Bible.[4]

The so-called Athanasian Synopsis Sanctae Scripturae of the sixth century A.D., and the Stichometry of Nicefores, Patriarch of Constantinope of the ninth century, classify the Odes among the

---

[1]Rendel J. Harris and Alphonse Mingana, The Odes and Psalms of Solomon (Manchester: University Press, 1920), II, 9.

[2]Ibid., II, 12.

[3]The Old Testament of the Sahidic Bible is a translation of the Septuagint.

[4]Odes i, v, vi, xxii, xxv.

Antilegomena, or disputed books, while the Muratorian Canon and Zonaras in the twelfth century possibly refer to them but in a sense of definite rejection.

The Odes were known to the early Fathers of the Church. Suffice to mention that Ignatius, Barnabas, Aristides, Theophilus of Antioch, Cyril of Jerusalem all knew the Odes or were acquainted with their style and ideas.[1] In the significant case of Ignatius of Antioch, the same two scholars in 1930, on the basis of the Syriac Ignatius, have proved that this Father quoted directly from OS xiii. 3.[2]

The names of these fathers suggest early dates. Barnabas wrote around 100 A.D., Ignatius before 110 A.D., and Aristides ca. 130 A.D. These dates in conjunction with the Testimony Book of Lactantius, which consider the Odes as canonical early in the second century, justify a conclusion that the date of the Odes is late in the first century A.D.

A final remark in favor of a non-Bardaisanian authorship and, therefore, of an early date is the use of the Odes by Cyril of Jerusalem. If the Odes are a part of the 150 hymns or odes that Bardaisan wrote in imitation of King David "and all the inhabitants of Edessa sang them,"[3] the name of Bardaisan could not have been forgotten or canceled. Let us remember Ephrem's polemic against Bardaisan. How then could Cyril of Jerusalem, in Western Syria, use a heretical product in his instructions of the catechumens? The pseudo-epigraph-

---

[1]Harris and Mingana, pp. 40-60.

[2]Alphonse Mingana, "Woodbrooke Studies," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. XIV (January, 1930).

[3]Maryosip, p. vii.

ical title, Odes of Solomon, did not prevent Bardaisan's association with the 150 hymns which, by hypothesis, include our hymns. These could not at the same time be Solomonic, i.e., pseudo-epigraphical, and Bardaisanian. Cyril's use of the hymns, therefore, attest to a non-Bardaisanian authorship. On the basis of these facts, we are entitled to the following conclusions.

The Odes of Solomon have been written late in the first century B.C. As such it is anterior to the Gospel of Truth and the similarities between the two documents can be explained only on the assumption that the author of the EV knew the Odes or at least the spiritual atmosphere where these arose.

The Odes of Solomon on the Borderline between Orthodoxy and Valentinianism

A final question related to the Odes of Solomon is their doctrinal character.

The "cloudy indetermination" of the poetry of the Odes, as Theodore Zahn calls it,[1] gave impetus to H. Gunkel to relate the Odes to Gnosticism,[2] and to observe that their language is cryptic and is addressed to the initiated.[3]

The author disregards the story of the human Jesus and moves within a spiritual atmosphere. He deals with ideas, not with actual history. He concentrates on christology, immortal life, the love of Christ.

---

[1]Theodore Zahn, "Die Oden Salomos," Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, XXXI (Jahrgang 1910), 667.

[2]Herman Gunkel, "Die Oden Salomos," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XI (1910), 291 seq.

[3]Ibid., 320-22.

The Odist draws some of his images from esoteric sources. This is evidenced by his use of some ambiguous expressions. Such are: "the Garment of Light,"[1] "the things that are betwixt,"[2] "the worlds,"[3] "the abysses."[4] All these are Gnostic terms. The "Garment of Light," in The Acts of Thomas, is the brilliant robe that the Royal Prince will wear at his return home from Egypt, the realm of matter and oblivion.[5] The allegory symbolizes the descent and ascent of the soul, as in Pistis Sophia, a Gnostic document of the third century A.D. where Jesus goes up to heaven garbed in the same brilliant robe.[6]

"The Middle" according to Pistis Sophia[7] is a group of heavenly powers which at the end of times are commissioned to baptize the souls and give the seal. In Valentinianism it generally means the Psychic realm that lies between the spiritual and the material world. The term also appears in EV 17. 1. 34 seqq.

The worlds and the abysses denote personal supernatural powers.

Another trait of the Odes is their emphasis on salvation through Knowledge.[8]

---

[1] OS xi. 10; xxi. 2. [2] OS xxii. 2.

[3] OS vii. 14; xii, 4; xvi. 20; xix. 4.

[4] OS xxiv. 5; xxxi. 1.

[5] Montagne R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 411 seqq.

[6] Carl Schmidt, Pistis Sophia ("Koptisch Gnostische Schriften," Vol. I; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1925), pp. xi-xv.

[7] Ibid., p. lxxxvi.

[8] OS xxiii. On this, see p.

Ode xxiii refers to a letter which conveys the Thought of the Most High and manifests the Son, and is attached to a wheel.[1] P. Batiffol has observed that the wheel means at the same time a means of torture; as such it may denote the Cross,[2] and also an apocalyptic weapon which exterminates adversaries.[3] The "letter" plays a prominent role in the Acts of Thomas.[4] It is related to the Hymn of the Soul mentioned above which is of Syriac origin and older than the Acts of Thomas. The "letter" sent by his parents flies like an eagle to the young prince. The Gospel of Truth mentions a "Book," probably the Book of the Living which is connected with Jesus and his redeeming work.

Another Gnostic trait of the Odes is the confusion that arose among the spiritual powers in the various parts of the Universe on the manifestation of the Logos. OS 24 relates that turmoil to the Baptism of Jesus, EV 25. 35 - 27. 9 to the descent of the Logos, and and Pistis Sophia xi-xv to the ascent of Christ.

From the above data we may gather that the Odes of Solomon include certain elements which betray a Gnostic background. The least that we can say is that the same material is also used in a Gnostic sense. As in the case of Ignatius, however, we cannot maintain that Gnostic terminology is necessary an evidence of Gnosticism

---

[1] OS xxiii. 5, 11.

[2] J. Labourt and P. Batiffol, Les Odes de Salomon: une oeuvre chrétienne des environs de l'an 100-120; traduction française et introduction historique (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, T. Gabalda, 1911), p. 84.

[3] Proverbs xx:26. James, p. 411 seq.

[4] EV 19. 35; 20. 12; 21. 4; 22. 39.

but there is no doubt that the Odist lives in the neighborhood of Gnosticism. His emphasis on salvation as Illumination does not make him any more Gnostic than the member of the Eastern Church who receives Baptism as an illumination. His Doceticism, on the other hand, has not been accepted by all scholars.

It must be pointed out, however, that the Odist stands on the borderline between Gnosticism and Orthodoxy. His terminology can be converted into pure Gnosticism with not much pressure. It is the opinion of the author that the Gospel of Truth used the Odes and directed the material and ideas it borrowed towards the direction of Gnosticism, while Cyril of Jerusalem and Ephrem the Syrian utilized them in the direction of Orthodoxy.

According to this interpretation Schenke's point of view becomes secondary. If he maintains that the Odes, like the Gospel of Truth, are not Valentinian, by the same token one might infer that the Odes are not Gnostic either. Harris and Mingana, who knew the Odes as few since have known them, are firm in their view that the Odes are not a Gnostic work.[1]

Valentinus, they say, is too early, and from what we may gather from the Gospel of Truth, he is of quite a different type of poet than the author of the Odes. On the other hand, lesser Gnostics with their bewildering speculations lack the clarity of ideas and the genuineness of inspiration of the author of the Odes.

The fact, however, remains that the Gospel of Truth and the Odes breathe the same atmosphere. The priority in time of the Odes

---

[1]Harris and Mingana, p. 205.

and their original material makes Valentinus a borrower, but one, however, who turned the stream of tradition towards his own speculation. He and his followers did the same thing to Johannine Christianity and in particular to the fourth Gospel.

R. M. Grant considers the Odes as Valentinian, and possibly as the work of Valentinus himself.[1] On the other hand he admits that there is no real attempt among the Church fathers to refute the Valentinian doctrine set forth in the Gospel of Truth or in the Odes of Solomon. That means that the type of Valentinianism of these two documents is close to Orthodoxy. Both works belong to the formative years of Christian doctrine. Their doctrine of Trinity, however, especially that of the Odes, agrees with the "Nicene Creed," which was adopted by the First General Council. But the creed of Nicea is the creed of the Church of Caesarea Palestine, and, this again, brings us back to the vicinity of the place where the Odes were composed. Both belong to Syrian or, at least bilingual, Christianity.

---

[1]Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 34.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DOCTRINE OF VALENTINUS AND THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH

HISTORY, PSYCHOLOGY, THEOLOGY AND COSMOLOGY

Once an answer has been given to the problem of literary sources in chapter ii, one must remember that the doctrine of Valentinus is not merely the expression of his religious or philosophical faith; it is the outgrowth of his whole life and, as such, it covers all aspects of his intellectual, emotional, and volitional experiences. He lived his faith, and he formulated it in terms of the crises and storms as well as the consolations of his life. The right approach, therefore, to Valentinus' doctrine is not the rational one which studies ideas like geometrical theorems, but the comprehensive one which includes both ideas and actual experiences, theory and action, history, psychology, theology, and cosmology.

In a previous chapter we studied the doctrine of Valentinus in terms of the literary sources that contain it and we stressed the importance of the fragments of Valentinus himself. Here we will concentrate on Fragment I and particularly on a single significant element that it contains: the element of Fear which derives from Ignorance. In the face of the superior nature of man's reason, the creator angels felt a sense of fear. This is similar to the feeling of fear that men experience in the presence of sacred images because of what they represent.

The author of the Gospel of Truth gives to fear and terror a cosmic significance, since the material world is derivative of this passion. Both the passion and its by-product are illusions and disappear at the advent of Truth and in this respect they are similar to a nightmare.

The element of fear should be studied in the person of the author rather than in its relationship to the Universe as a creative power, and the Nightmare must be considered as the expression of his psychological structure. It reveals a person that is burdened with heavy psychological tensions and insecurity. Thus, what is essential to the psychological complexity of an individual human being is also essential to the creation of the World.

The Nightmare as including colored dreams hints to the age of the dreamer. The author should be in his twenties or early thirties when he experienced it.

The assertion that the Nightmare is not a mere parable to show the illusionary character of the world but also an actual experience of the author might be objected to on the basis of actual or alleged parallels in contemporary literary sources. We may detect existing similarities between it and Homer and also a Hindu parable on the illusionary nature of existence, as well as other sources. The objection, however, is not decisive since the author could at the same time be familiar with such sources and also have active dreaming experiences filled with the content of his education. A comparison with Artemidorus' interpretation of dreams yields negative results. The Gospel of Truth has nothing to do with his dreams.

Fragment I, the Psychology of Valentinus and the Cosmology of the Valentinian Sources: Ignorance and Fear

The personal element establishes a connecting link between the Gospel of Truth and Valentinus himself; this is on the basis of a peculiar doctrinal emphasis that is found in the fragments, in the Valentinian outline of the other sources, and in the cosmology and psychology of the author of the Gospel of Truth. This is the correlation between terror and fear, passion and matter.

This correlation between terror, passion, and matter is an emphasis that appears both in the Gospel of Truth and in the Valentinian fragments. It is also paralleled by the other Valentinian sources, and it must have something to do with the structure of the personality, not only of Valentinus, but also of the author of the Gospel of Truth. Behind the written documents, we have in both cases an author who is personally troubled with the passions of Sophia herself.

All sources reflect a single psychological drama which finds its expression in the texts themselves. Sagnard and Quispel emphasized the artistic poetical character of a man that stands behind the fragments and the other sources. Quispel placed emphasis on the visionary mystic experience and the tragic conception of life of the same man.

It is my purpose to further analyze the structure of the personality of the man who formulated a pessimistic explanation of the universe in terms of a myth that Hippolytus (vi. 42. 2) called tragic.

Reverse exemplarism is a good method of interpreting the expe-

rience of the authors. It shows how a personal experience is projected to the world above, and it serves to create an interpretation of the whole set of reality. Here the metaphysical theory of the authors of our documents is rooted in their psychology, and this statement can be based on literary sources and be correlated historically.

Ultimately the authors of the documents in question, namely, those of the fragments and of the Gospel of Truth, can be reduced to a common denominator; that is, a single author who is responsible for the writing of both of them, and also for an outline of his own, a kind of Valentinian catechism that is reproduced by the other sources. The core of this personal element is Ignorance, Fear, and Anxiety.

It is important to give a closer attention to the theme of fear in Fragment I. This is the most important fragment according to Sagnard.[1] Clement feels the same way in reproducing it in its original words: " αὐταῖς ταῖς λέξεσι. ."[2] These words are extracted from a letter of Valentinus.

According to this fragment, the angels had fashioned the body of the first man, Adam. The pre-existent Anthropos, who is the fourth male aeon of the Great Exposition of Irenaeus, invisibly communicated to Adam a germ of the supernatural essence " σπέρμα...τῆς ἄνωθεν οὐσίας "[3] by virtue of which the first man utters articulate speech, the outer manifestation of inner thought or logos. On

---

[1]Sagnard, Études de Philosophie Médiévale, XXXVI, 401.

[2]Clement Alex. Strom. II, cap. viii. 36. 5.

[3]Ibid.

hearing this, Terror befells the angels because they discover a superior nature in their creation.

The angels are the angels of the Demiurge and, as such, as their father, they are of a psychic or animal nature. This nature is wholly different from the pneumatic or spiritual nature of the seed that had been secretly placed within Adam. Irenaeus i. 7. 4 mentions the astonishment of the Demiurge on the utterances of the prophets who had the same superior seed operating in them.

There is a parallelism between the fear of the Demiurge and his angels, in face of the superiority of their rational human creation, and the fear of the artists. These, also, experience terrors, " φόβοι ," in face of the images that they have fashioned because these are made in the name of God, "εἰς ὄνομα Θεοῦ ,"[1] and, as such, they convey the power of God. The Name is the means by which the face, representing the person, is being honored. Thus, we have the true God, the majesty of the Face or the Name, and the face itself which is furnishing the painter, the model, and the image, or the world. Clement knew the context of these speculations and informs us that the Painter is Sophia which shapes the Demiurge in the image of the true God.[2] Our world is a further image of the Demiurge and his angels. Here we have the Hellenistic theory of images and reflections.

---

[1] O. Stählin, "Alexandrinus Clemens," Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1905-1909), XIII, 132.

[2] Here the fragment is supplemented by Clement's interpretation of the Valentinian Gnosis.

In the first place, we have in this fragment a sharp contrast between the two natures, the spiritual or pneumatic and the psychic or animal. If there are two natures, however, it is necessar to accept a third one, namely, matter. No Valentinian document would profess the existence of the two higher natures--the spiritual and the psychic--at the expense of the third one, the material one.

The psychic element stands as a bridge between the spiritual and the material. Fragment VIII offers us the series of successive suspensions from flesh (matter) to soul (psychic), air, ether, and ultimately, the deep or womb which is the source of all existence.[1] Thus, by inference, we do have three natures in Fragment I, and the distinction of three natures is the cornerstone of Valentinianism.

On the basis of the theory of envelopments, one nature is included in the other. The spiritual nature sleeps within the psychic up to the moment it is awakened. This awakening the Valentinians call Redemption or Conversion.

Fear, on the other hand, is one of the passions of Sophia. Both Irenaeus and Hippolytus preserve that bit of tradition. According to Irenaeus[2] Sophia, once excluded from the Pleroma, is unable to cross the Limit that separates her now from the divine world "διὰ τὸ συμπεπλέχθαι τῷ πάθει ." In this connection four passions are mentioned, namely, sorrow (λύπη), terror (φόβος), anxiety (ἀπορία), and ignorance (ἄγνοια). Hippolytus has only fear, sorrw, and anxiety;[3] however, in 32. 5 he explicitly mentions "four" passions,

---

[1]Fragment VIII, Hippolytus Refutatio vi. 37. 6-8.

[2]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 4. 1[b] (Theme A).

[3]Hippolytus Refutatio 32. 2 (Theme B).

namely, fear as the first, sorrow, anxiety, and supplication.

Since Ignorance is the fundamental passion of Sophia, the one which excluded her from the divine Pleroma, we may consider the others, namely, terror, sorrow, anxiety and its counterpart supplication as by-products of ignorance.[1] The passions of Sophia constitute her downward tendency, while conversion gives her an upward one.

What is important is that the passions of Sophia are not mere emotions or qualities but substantial entities. They could not have been annihilated because they were habitual and strong.[2] In her upward tendency Sophia separates them from herself and thus gives them separate existence. Now they are incorporeal matter (ἀσώματος ὕλη , Irenaeus; ὑποσταταί οὐσίαι , Hippolytus).

Matter and demons derives from anxiety and sorrow. Fear gives the psychic element, namely, the souls of men and of animals.

Fear is also the origin of the Demiurge.[3] The latter's essence is the psychic element and his law, the law of the Old Testament is a law based on fear. Thus, fear prevails in the whole area of creation. It covers nature, law and history. It is a universal element that underlies all living creatures including man himself.

Fear as attached to the psychic element appears also in the scene of the Baptism of Jesus in the Jordan river. According to the Clementine Excerptum of Theodotus 5. 2, John the Baptist hears the voice "ἐν πνεύματι ." No simple or psychic man could hear the voice

---

[1]The exact identification of the various passions is immaterial due to the Valentinian fluidity of terms.

[2]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 4, 5; cf. Hippolytus Refutatio 32. 5.

[3]Ibid., 32. 6-7.

without terror. "καθό δέ ἄνθρωπός τίς ἐστι μόνον ἀκούσας κατεπλάγη ." The words used here by Clement are ἐφοβήθη and κατεπλάγη . Fragment I uses the word κατεπλάγησαν . In connection with the passions of Sophia, Irenaeus uses both φόβος and ἔκπληξις ,[1] while Hippolytus uses φόβος .[2]

Thus, fear is a cosmic element in all documents of Valentinianism, Fragment I included. It is the origin of animal life and the essence of the creator of this world. It is the major passion of Sophia, actually her first passion, and it is the result of ignorance that expelled Sophia out of the Pleroma.

The Gospel of Truth and Its Relationship to Ignorance and Fear: The Cosmology of the Tractate and the Nightmare

If we will turn our attention to the Gospel of Truth we will notice in the first place how much attention the author pays to personal experience and, secondly, the prominent role that terror and fear play in that document.

There is a personal tone in the document which expresses the personal experience of the author. In this the Gospel finds a close parallel to the Odes of Solomon.

EV 25. 19 stresses the importance of immediate personal experience on the basis of which he explains the things above: "certainly, if these things happened to each one of us. . . ." This reference to the individual's experience goes throughout the whole document cov-

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 4. 2.

[2] Hippolytus Refutatio 32. 1.

ering the nightmare with its elements of terror and anxiety, the rest of the Gnostics and the author himself. Psychological situations which characterize the Valentinians before and after their conversion to Valentinianism are projected to the whole Universe.

Words resounding with emotion are used in connection with the Father and Jesus. We hear of the Clemency of the Father,[1] of the merciful Jesus,[2] of Jesus of Infinite gentleness,[3] of the sweet Father[4] and of his sweetness.[5]

The Gnostics are the children of the Father,[6] like the aeons themselves.[7] They are children of Understanding,[8] the elect little children to whom belongs the "Gnosis" of the Father,[9] the sons,[10] and sons of the Name.[11]

This language has its parallel only in the Odes of Solomon, where the Odist states that he was "carried like a child by its mother."[12]

Personal experience can especially be studied in the elements of fear and terror. This time they are connected with Πλάνη or Error which are the sources of matter and of the material world:

> [EV 17. 9] . . . it was this
> [10] ignorance concerning the Father which produced Anguish and Terror. Anguish
> became dense like a mist,

---

[1] EV 19. 24; cf. OS xiv. 6. [2] EV 20.10. [3] EV 24. 8.

[4] EV 33. 33; 42. 8. [5] EV 24. 9; 31. 20; 41. 3.

[6] EV 43. 19-24; 27. 13. [7] EV 27. 13; 33. 39.

[8] EV 32. 38. [9] EV 19. 28. [10] EV 33. 39. [11] 38. 28.

[12] OS xxxv. 5. Byzantine iconography presents Mary's soul as an infant in the hands of Jesus. This Dormition scene is probably based on a similar idea.

> so that no one could
> see. For this reason, Error
> [15] was strengthened. It elaborated its own Matter
> in emptiness,
> without knowing Truth.
> It applied itself to the modeling of a creature
> trying to provide in
> [20] beauty the equivalent of Truth.

This is a crucial passage. The theme of the cosmogonical character of "passion" is repeated in a series of contrasts that betray a sharp dualism in the heart of existence. The opposed principles are Truth and Error, God and the world, matter and spirit, optimism[1] and pessimism, [2] reality and illusion, knowledge and ignorance, anguish and terror from being far from God,[3] as against joy on the acceptance of the Gospel of Truth and Knowledge of God.

The important statement is that ignorance concerning the Father produced Anguish and Terror. Let us remember for a moment that the passions of Sophia in the Valentinian documents which we have just examined, consider ignorance to be the reason for the fall of the aeon Sophia from the Pleroma, and that the "passions" of Sophia are evolving "in ignorance."

Furthermore, I wish to stress the fact that there is a subjective psychological meaning attached here to Anguish, as well as an ontological one. This is evidenced by the fact that the "All," i.e., the totality of beings, was in the Father, that the emergence of Πλάνη or Error was not a humiliation for the Father,[4] and that Error disap-

---

[1] The world of God.

[2] The creation of Error, the world.

[3] This by implication. Cf., also, EV 16. 31.

[4] EV 17. 21.

pears as a mist as soon as Truth reveals itself:

> [EV 24. 29] Deficiency came into existence because they [the aeons] did not [30] know the Father, so when they know the Father, Deficiency, at that instance, disappears. As a person's ignorance, at the moment when he comes to [31] know, disappears of its own accord; as darkness dissolves at the appearance [25. 1] of light; so also Deficiency is eliminated by the fact of Plenitude.

These instructive verses inform us that the reality of God is not disturbed by the presence of Error and Deficiency, which are nothing else than the lack of God. This lack, however, is not a cosmic event only. It is also an inner condition of the soul of man who is faced by the illusionary existence of the outside world.

This idea appears to be a reflection of a deep personal experience that the author of the Gospel of Truth sometimes had in his life, a condition of spiritual emptiness, or of lack of meaning, of disappointment with the visible world.

The author, with a sense of disapproval of life, considers the beauty of this world as an illusion, as a creation of Error which tried in vain to imitate the real world.

The emphasis on the relationship of the ignorance of the Father to Terror prevails throughout the whole document, as does the element of relief through Gnosis and illumination. The terror-Error-Illusion relationship as opposed to the experience of conversion is expressed in terms of a nightmare:

> [EV 28. 28] When the light of dawn appears, [then] this [man] [30] understands that the Terror

which had seized upon him, was
nothing. Thus they were
ignorant concerning the Father
[29. 1] whom they did not see. As long as
Ignorance inspired them with terror
[and] confusion, and [left] them unstable,
torn, and
[29. 5] divided, there were many
illusions by which they were
haunted, and
empty fictions, as if
they were sunk in
sleep, [and] as if they found themselves as prey to
troubled dreams. Either they are
fleeing somewhere, or else, lacking
strength, they are, nevertheless, urged on to pursue
such and such a one; or again they find themselves involved
[15] in brawls, giving blows, on the contrary,
receiving blows themselves;
or they are
falling from great heights,
or else they fly off into
the air, even though they have no wings.
[20] Other times it is as if someone were
trying to kill them, even though there is no one
pursuing them; or else it is as if
they themselves were killing the people about them,
for they are covered with their
[25] blood. Until the
moment when those who are
passing through all these things wake up.

The nightmare presents two important aspects. First of all, the element of fear and anxiety that is always related to this kind of dream and, secondly, the relationship of fear to the psychology and the cosmology of the author.

The nightmare, I believe, is more than a literary device or a simple parable. It reflects the personality of the author of the Gospel of Truth. As he placed so much emphasis on fear and terror, so he expressed these terrors in terms of a dream.

One cannot escape the impression that the nightmare was his dream, a dream that tortured him during a hot Egyptian or Roman night,

as his psychological complexes tortured him during the day. It is a nightmare that expressed and symbolized the tragedy of his own life.

Modern psychologists may have interesting things to say about the details of such a nightmare, as a symbol of inner psychological disturbance. What is certain about the Gospel is that its author knows the sense of Anguish and Terror in face of an unfriendly Universe. Unlike, however, the atheistic type of existentialist of our days, he overcomes his Pessimism by searching after the Father, whom he finally discovers.

This discovery fills the shadowy depths of his soul, another place of darkness and vacuity, with Joy, Grace, Rest, and Light. As soon as the Knowledge of the Father arrives, Terror and Ignorance automatically disappear, and Knowledge and Rest prevail. Embraces and kisses of reconciliation follow and the elect tastes the sweetness of the Father.[1]

---

[1]I had already formulated these thoughts on the psychological significance of the nightmare in the Gospel of Truth and its relation to the author of the document, when I decided that a confirmation of my thoughts was needed. I am grateful to Dr. H. Nelson, medical director of the Mercyville Psychiatric Hospital, Aurora, Illinois, for the time he gave me in discussing my points of view and for the statement he wrote after reading the nightmare itself. The following is Dr. Nelson's statement.

"It must be pointed out that man reflects his innermost conflicts and feelings in dream activity, an activity designed, according to authorities, to permit sleep to remain undisturbed. Thus, anxiety resulting from the stresses of every day living, which does not cease during sleep, is literally "poured off" through dreams. It is known that all persons dream nightly even despite inability to recall, and this is born out through electroencephalographic studies of sleep activity.

"Freud in his own theoretical interpretations of dreaming expressed the opinion that the content of the dream was subject to distortion as a camouflage for the emotional quality. The less the distortion, the closer to reality the dream approaches, the greater the anxiety to the point that sleep disruptivity is reached. The

The Nightmare, the Age of the Dreamer and the Author of the Gospel of Truth

The nightmare is also significant from a different point of view. It mentions fighting and blood,[1] but blood is red in color and colored dreams, according to recent conclusions in the field of psychology, are related to the age of the dreamer.

---

term of nightmare is in more common usage.

"Although man has evidenced interest in dreams for eons of time, much of this preoccupation has been of a mystical or magical quality. In them he saw prophecy, and governments rose and fell on the predications of such activity. However, in the current scientific age we have cast our eyes on dreams, not only as a physiologically, but psychologically significant phenomena. The accuracy of the analytic interpretation of the symbolic communication of the dream can only be measured by the knowledge of the life, conflicts, reactivities of the dreamer. Nevertheless, certain generalized concepts can be reflected even in the dreams of unknown persons even though the sources of stress of the factors provoking such content is lacking.

"In reference to the description given of the "troubled dream," anxiety is the manifest quality with which is associated insecurity as reflected in "falling from great heights," fear--"they are fleeing somewhere or else lacking strength," hostility both projected--"it is as if they, themselves, were killing the people about them for they are covered with their blood"--and introjected--"other times it is as if someone were trying to kill them.

"These are not early century limited dreams for they have a 20th century quality to them, but then, has man in his instinctual drives and defense mechanisms really changed?

"One can theorize that the author of these dreams was one who was experiencing difficulty with his own aggressive impulses and was expressing them in a direct, hostile fashion and yet fear of retaliation and punishment leads to internalization of such impulses and thus he becomes the punished victim. Guilt over such impulses also can lead to the same role.

"An additional point that appears in the dream is the evidence of omnipotence as reflected in "they fly off into the air even though they have no wings." The almost grandiose expansiveness of the person, desirous of greatness, can so easily be seen.

"In review, the dream portrays individual aggressivity striving for recognition, dealing with problems of insecurity provoked perhaps by a not too understanding or accepting world. The consequent provoked hostilities are handled in both projective and introjective manners and thus he kills and is killed in the exaggerated symbolism of a dream."

[1] EV 29. 20.

Recent psychological tests performed in clinical experiments have revealed important and new information concerning the nature and quality of dreams. In addition to proving, after careful interrogation of specially chosen subjects, that color was found in 82.7 per cent of their dreams,[1] there are indications, as well, that the content and nature of dreams might well indicate the age of the dreamer. As for the tests concerning color in dreams, a total of 100 awakenings were made on 38 subjects (28 males and 10 females) who ranged in age from 18 to 33, in an investigation conducted by Drs. Edwin Kahn, William Dement, Charles Fischer, and Joseph Barmack.[2]

The awakenings indicated that in 87 instances of dream recall, color was present 70.1 per cent of the time. In addition, results would indicate that color in dreams strongly pointed to the age of the dreamer. This is, indeed, another of the findings associated with the dream experiments, namely, that to a great extent the age of the dreamer is often revealed, within reasonable limits of course, by particular aspects of the dream.[3]

Such conclusions would seem to be supported by experiments conducted in the Sleepy Eye High School Experiment. These experi-

---

[1]E. S. Tauber and M. R. Green, "Color in Dreams," American Journal of Psychotherapy, XVI (1962), 221-29; and E. Aserinsky and N. Kleitman, "Regularly occurring Periods of Eye Motility, and Concomitant Phenomena, During Sleep," Science, CXVIII (September 4, 1953), 273-74.

[2]Edwin Kahn, William Dement, Charles Fischer, and Joseph Barmack, "Incidence of Color in Immediately Recalled Dreams," Science, CXXXVII (September 28, 1962), 1054-55.

[3]Ibid.

ments conducted by Miss Nancy Fering showed the following findings: (1) Dream that took place out of doors are experienced especially by young people; and (2) colored dreams are peculiar to young people between the age of sixteen and nineteen.[1]

The above psychological experiments and the conclusions based upon them make legitimate a hypothesis on the age of the author of the Gospel of Truth. When he experienced the nightmare, or at least the nightmare which involves bloodshed, he must have been under the age of thirty-three.

It is not necessary to assume that he put his dream into writing at the time he experienced it. He may have used it over and over again as an illustration of his doctrine throughout the years, as he does in the Gospel of Truth. One point, however, must be emphasized; i.e., that the author from the age of his youth was a person with psychological tensions. If it is true, as it is, that the formative years of a human being determine the psychological structure of the years to come, we may surmise that Valentinus was prone to special psychological disturbances in the years of his youth.

The Nightmare and Contemporary Literary Sources

The "nightmare" of the Gospel of Truth gave us the opportunity to make some psychological remarks on the personality of the latter's author. If the author of the Gospel, however, draws his material on the nightmare from literary sources, then, the whole

---

[1] Chicago Tribune, February 25, 1965, sec. 2, p. 24.

argument based on the nightmare may collapse, and the nightmare may be a literary device of the author's parable, expressive of the illusionary character of the world.

This leads us to the discussion of the possible literary sources that the author may have utilized and to their relationship to the author's psychology. We will examine some close and remote sources that have been suggested to explain the Gospel's dreams: Homer's Odyssey and Iliad, an Indian myth, and Artemidorus' Oniro-criticon will be discussed.[1]

There is no doubt whatsoever that the parable of the night-mare in the EV is meant to convey one single idea, namely, that the world and life are illusionary and unreal, similar to the unpleasant illusions of a single or several nightmares.

The emotional structure of the person of the author as well as of Valentinus himself, however, gives us the possibility of sup-porting the hypothesis that the author refers to his own experiences in sleep which reflect his own psychological complexes. Enough has been said on that point in the previous paragraphs.

The nightmare, however, raises a philological problem. The author may reflect more than his personal psychology on the matter. Many of his contemporaries were obsessed with the search for the Infinite, as Ménard points out.[2] If analyzed to its constituent elements, this theme may even offer us literary parallels to the nightmare:

---

[1]Roger Pack (ed.), Artemidorus Daldianus. Onirocriticon, Libri V (Lipsiae in Aedibus: B. G. Teubneri, 1963).

[2]Ménard, L'Évangile de Vérité . . . ., p. 147.

The fall from great heights may designate giddiness in the face of Destiny or a feeling of emptiness in face of the vanity of the world.[1] It may go back to the story of Elpenor, the companion of Odysseus who fell off of Circe's palace, was killed and left unburied. Odysseus in his descent to Hades meets him first and hears his petition for burial which is the last kind of security that can be granted to a dead man.[2]

Flight without wings is related to ecstasies in Philo,[3] and EV 29. 11-14 has been traced back to the Iliad[4] by G. Quispel.[5]

> As in a dream a man is not able to follow one who runs
> from him, nor can the runner escape, nor the other pursue
> him,
> so he could not run him down in his speed, nor the other
> get clear.[6]

H. Ringgren attributes the whole parable to Indian sources.[7]

We must admit that the author of our document is a learned man. He is familiar at least with Greek and Latin literature.[8] But if he reflects the anxieties of his own time through channels that are not his own creation, or if he makes use of literary elements

---

[1] Ibid., p. 148.

[2] Homer Odyssey x. 552; xi. 52; xii. 10.

[3] Philo Spec. Leg. ii. 3; cf. CH xi. 19.

[4] Homer Iliad xxii. 199-201.

[5] Quispel, The Jung Codex, p. 52.

[6] Richmond Lattimore, The Iliad of Homer (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951), p. 440.

[7] Ringgren, Religion och Bibel, pp. 45 and 53.

[8] Ménard's Index on Greco-Latin literature in L'Évangile de Vérité . . . , pp. 225-27.

that he is familiar with, it does not follow that his quotations are in the vacuum. Personal experience is not necessarily dissociated from literature. It is also socially conditioned, and the knowledge of both literature and oral tradition and familiarity with the problems of his own environment are affecting his realm of ideas and emotions. Artemidorus correctly remarks that dreams with a philological content, such as epics, iambs, sayings, and epigrams, are seen only by educated men.[1]

There is no choice between either or in matters of personal experience as related to acquired knowledge. Many dreams experienced by our contemporaries and the kind of interpretations given to them, can easily be traced--even today among contemporary Greeks--to ancient divinatory traditions, written or oral, which have survived to the present day through the uninterrupted stream of Greek national life. People are born and grow up within this atmosphere, and the establishment of a causal relationship between dreams and reality as attempted by Artemidorus is not altogether irrelevant. Certain symbolisms are simply based on experience, both for Artemidorus and for us.

Before going into a comparison between the EV and the work of Artemidorus, a note is necessary for one of Ménard's assertions. He believes that the dreams belong to the Valentinians, or the Spirituals.[2] This simply is impossible. The dreams of the EV belong to the man who has not yet been converted to knowledge. They refer to the

---

[1]Inasmuch as the Roger Pack edition of Artemidorus' work (see p. 216, n. 1, above) is the only source used in this study by this writer, the numeral preceding the colon will be the page in Pack's edition, and the numeral(s) following the colon will be the lines of Artemidorus' work specifically referred to; in this instance, 284:3-9.

[2]Ménard, L'Évangile de Vérité . . . , p. 147.

condition of ignorance before the advent of Gnosis which is a relief from illusion and its dreams. What they are meant to describe is the condition of man, while he is still plunged in the sleep of ignorance before he is awakened by the light of Knowledge.

If the above statement is true, it follows that the dreams of the EV have no prophetic character whatsoever. Our author places much emphasis on his dreams. He is not exhibiting, however, any tendency towards Occultism. His disciple Marcus the Magician, and Plotinus and his disciples in the next century, may delve into it, but our author has no interest in it. He is, of course, a visionary, since he experienced the vision of both the Logos and, in all probability, the dreams he is relating, but he has no oneiromantic interest whatsoever.

The Nightmare and Contemporary Literary Sources
Artemidorus of Daldis

A comparison between our author and Artemidorus is not irrelevant for the above reason. It may, on the contrary, shed some light upon the approach of both authors to certain common things, if this approach will be projected against the historical background of their time. Both authors belong to the second century A.D.

Artemidorus is familiar with all the books of his predecessors, even though he has claims to originality based on observation and experience, as well as with the ideas of the soothsayers of the market place, in spite of their ill reputation. He has travelled for many years in Greece, Asia Minor, the islands, and Italy, going to the gatherings of men and listening to dreams and their issues

in a critical spirit.[1] His observation of the realization of the dreams established a relation between dream and its issue. This relation was based on several factors, such as the interaction of the stars,[2] the intervention of the gods,[3] the natural divinatory character of the human soul,[4] and the conditions of soul and body.[5]

Both the dreams and their issues are described in terms of the ideas, customs, historical circumstances of the times, knowledge of literature, etc., of the dreams, and of Artemidorus himself; therefore the Onirocriticon of Artemidorus is extremely important to the historian for its references to the actual life of the historical period in which Artemidorus lived and wrote.

It is also a source for Hellenistic Science, Dialectic, Logic, and elaborate Methodology, since Artemidorus is starting his classification and interpretation of dreams from the scientific presuppositions of the day proceeding scientifically even though, according to our standards, his knowledge is pseudoscientific. His reference of each dream to a certain correspondence in actual life, a historical source for the study of this life, is interesting. This correspondence is nothing else than the Hellenistic doctrine of sympathies and antipathies.[6]

---

[1] Pack, 2:11-27; 100:1-20; 202:7 - 203:15; 236:1 - 238:10; 300:18-26; 301: - 302:11.

[2] Ibid., 283:20 - 284:3.

[3] Ibid., 16:3, 7; 246:21; 247:100. [4] Ibid., 246:21.

[5] Ibid., 14:14; 15:1; 239:17 seq.

[6] Ibid., 84:1 seqq. The methodology of Artemidorus and its relation to Hellenistic Science would be an interesting subject of investigation.

Artemidorus himself is so proud of his "Philosophy" or scientific knowledge that he was to relate his fame, of which he is sure, not to Ephesus, where he was born, but to Daldis, an insignificant township of Lydia in Asia Minor. Ephesus, he believes, has many famous names to present, while Daldis has none. He dedicates, therefore, his present book to Daldis out of gratitude to his mother who was born there.[1]

For our author himself, the nightmare consists of illusions,[2] empty fictions,[3] troubled dreams,[4] confusions,[5] and above all, " φαντασμαγορία ."[6] Artemidorus would have used for them the term " φάντασμα,"[7] which differs from the dream proper which is " ὅραμα " and " χρηματισμός " endowed with a futuristic perspective. The Phantasma refers to immediate happenings.

The EV nightmare can be broken down into the following elements: fleeing somewhere;[8] being under the threat to be killed without anyone pursuing them;[9] lacking strength to pursue someone;[10] giving blows[11] or receiving them;[12] trying to kill people around them;[13] being covered with the blood of the people they kill;[14] flying off into the air without wings;[15] and falling from great heights.[16] The insistence of the EV on this variety of nightmares is remarkable.

---

[1] Pack, 235:13-22.

[2] EV 29. 6. Notice the use of the plural.

[3] EV 29.8. [4] EV 29. 11. [5] EV 29. 29.

[6] EV 29. 32. [7] Pack, 6:14. [8] EV 29. 12. [9] EV 29. 21, 23.

[10] EV 29. 13, 14. [11] EV 29. 15. [12] EV 29. 16.

[13] EV 29. 22. 23. [14] EV 29. 25. [15] EV 29. 18. 19. [16] EV 29. 17.

Of the several cases of being chased in Artemidorus, being pursued and flying is the closest parallel.[1] It combines two different nightmares of the EV, being pursued and flying without wings; but these two illusions of the EV taken apart have exactly the same meaning as the combined dream of Artemidorus. It means fears and great dangers. Fear reaches such an extent that the dreamer is not able to flee on earth[2] but seeks refuge in heaven.

To be killed[3] means both good and evil in Artemidorus. To be killed by his own master means liberation of the slave. To be killed by another slave means enmity.[4] The emphasis on fighting and killing in the nightmare involves enmity and adversaries. The whole theme of the EV is antagonism between illusion and reality, light and darkness, Error and Truth. See also Error and the adversaries of Christ who wanted to kill him.[5] In the final analysis the themes converge.

I have not been able to find a parallel to the lacking of strength to pursue someone.

Giving and receiving blows is related to the subjects of fighting and inflicting wounds. The question is not about athletic wrestling here. To receive blows from an unknown man means sickness and death.[6] To receive blows by the gods, or the dead, or the subordinate ones is a bad premonition; it is beneficient, though, to be beaten by others.[7] To fight with a child is bad for the mature man,

---

[1]Pack, 193:16. [2]Cf. EV 29. 12 on lacking strength,
[3]EV 29. 21. 23. [4]Pack, 287:18. [5]EV 18. 23; 19. 15.
[6]Pack, 67:7-11. [7]Ibid., 180:18-25.

but good for the child if the child overcomes the man.[1] It announces acquisition of unexpected goods. Can we see here a remote allusion to the Valentinians as children? In the nightmare, giving blows is another expression of anxiety in sleep. The Gnostic is redeemed altogether by this.

Trying to kill people is a common theme in Artemidorus. War and weapons denote troubles and unhappiness to anyone except the soldiers and the artisans of weapons.[2] Sword means the wrath, the physical strength, and courage on the part of the dreamer.[3] Wheel or knife games mean supreme danger except for the professionals.[4] The application of dreams related to killing are many in Artemidorus. We are not concerned with the good or evil issue of such dreams but, rather, with close correspondence between the two authors via a common opinion belonging to their contemporaries.

Being covered with blood also has several meanings. A darkened and bloody sun is bad for everyone. It may even denote blindness.[5] Conversion to Gnosticism is equal to the removal of blindness in EV 30. 15, but there is no reference to a bloody sun in the EV. Blood seen in dreams has several meanings, both good and evil. Killing in our EV passage, however, is an expression of anxiety.

Flying off into the air without wings has several parallels in Artemidorus, with a variety of applications. One of them interests us. To fly without wings at a considerable distance from the soil means danger and fear to the dreamer. To fly around the roofs of the

---

[1] Ibid., 67:10-18. [2] Ibid., 153:18, 21.
[3] Ibid., 153:25-154:2. [4] Ibid., 82:28-83:2. [5] Ibid., 161:22-25.

houses means future troubles and disorder of the soul.[1]

Ménard explains the flight dream of EV 29. 18 and 19 in terms of ecstasies that the EV condemns in the manner of Philo.[2] In favor of his view of the condemnation of flying he calls attention to the evil connotation of air which was the abode of the evil spirits.[3] It is doubtful whether the gnostics had ecstatic experience before their initiation into the Valentinian church. The context of the nightmare is anxiety and agony, not ecstasies, which among the ancients was a blessed experience. It is very probable that the author's sojourn in the place of Repose and his subsequent silence on it is an ecstatic experience, but it has no relation to flying in the air. As for the evil connotation of the atmospheric air in the sublunar area, those among the ancients who related flight to ecstacies were not prevented from making the association.

Falling from heights is evil for Artemidorus. To fall within a precipice or to a brigand's den means bad expectations.[4] This fits the pessimistic setting of the EV nightmare.

A few words should be added here on the themes of intoxication and madness.

The acquisition of Gnosis brings man to the position of someone who, having been intoxicated, becomes sober and, having come to himself, reaffirms that which is essentially his own.[5] This is not a

---

[1] Ibid., 192:10-15.

[2] Philo Somn. i. 10.

[3] Werner Foerster, "ΑΗΡ, ΑΡΕΣΚΩ ," Theologishes Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Kittel (Stuttgart, 1932), I, 165.

[4] Pack, 14:27.

[5] EV 22. 17-19.

nightmare but a parable referring to the same subject as the nightmares, i.e., illusion and exit from it. Drunkenness is good neither to men nor women; it denotes foolishness except for those in fear who, by getting drunk, forget about their trouble.[1] A woman who saw in a dream that she was drunk, afterwards killed her three-year-old child.[2] Curiously enough, madness in dreams has good effects in awakening.[3]

There is no literary dependence of Artemidorus on the EV or vice versa. They have, however, certain things in common such as the pessimistic setting of certain dreams that occur in the Gospel of Truth and Artemidorus. Artemidorus bases his wisdom on observation and experience. In spite of what he maintains about his independence from sources, he seems not to have been quite deaf to the opinions of his contemporaries. It seems probable that the parallels between the two authors can be explained in terms of the then prevailing ideas to which both had access. Since this study laid emphasis on the personal character of the nightmares of the EV as dreams that its author had at one time or another during his life, the comparisons of the EV dreams with the description and realization of the only surviving Onirocriticon of the second century A.D. was a necessity. It has cleared the ground away from any possible theory of borrowing on the part of the EV. There is no oniromantic interest in the EV. The elements of the nightmare appear in Artemidorus, but in a variety of settings and subject to futuristic interpretation. Perhaps the EV's dreams are not dreams at all according

---

[1]Pack, 222:18-22. [2]Ibid., 26:1. [3]Ibid., 222:7-11.

to Artemidorus. Actually they may be justified by the conditions of the soul of the author of the EV, i.e., by the qualities of passions, especially of fear and hope, which are causes of dreams.[1] This is also the explanation that this study prefers to suggest.

As far as the general possible sources of the nightmare are concerned, it suffices to repeat that literary men can see literary dreams, and that there are several possible sources for it, such as Homer's Odyssey and Iliad, and the Hindu myth on the illusionary character of the world. The more sources we have the less we are sure that the EV is particularly indebted to this or to that one.

A major emphasis of this study is that in Valentinus psychology and cosmology are two aspects of one and the same experience, the one being the situation in the microcosm, the other in the macrocosm which is a projection of the former.

The means by which the two worlds, i.e., that of Valentinus' personal experience and the Universe, are connected is the myth of Sophia. Thus what happens to Valentinus is a repetition of what has happened to Sophia, the originator of the visible universe and of man. Conversely, the story of the Universe is repetition on a cosmic dimension of what a single human being had experienced in the innermost essence of his being.

Unity and plurality, identity of the self and a succession of various phases of existence are represented by the psychological conflicts of Valentinus and by the adventures of the heavenly Sophia.

Thus the sin of Valentinus corresponds to the fall of Sophia

---

[1] Ibid., 3:15 seqq.; 4:9.

and his repentance corresponds to her restoration.

The whole story under both of its aspects, the heavenly and the earthly was related to the idea of an elect seed, a progeny, and consequently to a sense of superiority over those who belonged to another race. This sense of pride coupled with the self-assertion of a personal talent threw Valentinus into the field of action and gave him pastoral ambitions.

Frustrated in his ambition to become bishop, he experienced the anticlimax of his zeal which expressed itself in disappointment and despair.

The story of Valentinus fits the description of the author of the Gospel of Truth which we can reconstruct from the data of this document. He, too, has the superiority complex, the sectarian pride and the pastoral ambitions of a sectarian shepherd. Since the respective pictures of the two men coincide we are entitled to equate them and maintain that Valentinus is the author of the Gospel of Truth.

Upon these premises we can also fix the date of the composition of the writing. The dates of Valentinus' active life and certain hints of the Gospel of Truth to actual developments of the Valentinian community in Rome, justify the assertion that the document was composed around A.D. 154.

The theory developed up to this point can give rise to an objection that the myth of Sophia which served as the central symbol of Valentinus' religious philosophy, is not Valentinus' invention and that it occurs in contemporary sources. The objection can be answered on the basis of the specific use of the myth made by Valentinus: while

the myth serves as an embellishment in other sources, it becomes essential to Valentinus' system explaining the whole set of existence.

CHAPTER IX

PSYCHOLOGY AND COSMOLOGY IN VALENTINUS

THE MYTH OF SOPHIA

The Psychology of Valentinus and the Adventures of Sophia: The Identity of Valentinus' Personality through the Various Phases of His Personal Tragedy

One of the fundamental presuppositions of Valentinus' psychology is the belief that man was essentially divine. There is nothing peculiar about this idea since it was a dogma for any Platonist, like Valentinus, that the human soul was an immortal god.

According to the same philosophical creed the soul was captive within the body which was the tomb of the soul. The Valentinians believed in the imprisonment of the soul within the material body, and, consequently they preached a resurrection of the soul from the body, not a resurrection of the physical body. The Epistle to Reghinus on the Resurrection, apparently a work of Valentinus, deals with that theme, and the Gospel of Truth agrees.[1]

Furthermore, the hellenistic scheme of the descent and ascent of the soul was widespread in Valentinus' time.

What was left, therefore, was to identify Sophia with the Soul collectively and individually. Sophia was divine. She descended to the lower regions of the universe, part of her was imprisoned

---

[1] EV 20. 31.

in matter which, according to Valentinianism is not preexistent but a by-product only of Sophia, and finally the enslaved divine element reascended with Sophia to the upper spheres.

So far we have nothing particularly Valentinian, except the identification of Sophia with the soul. Calendrical theories explained the fall of Sophia, but not its restoration. The reascent of the soul could account for that, once Sophia was identified with the soul. Sophia should reascend because she was divine like the soul itself. All this might develop on the ground of mere speculation.

What establishes a connecting link between the Sophia's down and up movement is her individualization in man's existence. Valentinus was a Christian, therefore, his point of view was anthropological and soteriological. His Christian faith, however, was mingled with Paganism, therefore, repudiating altogether the notion of human sin. Valentinus taught that the soul, as such, is divine and, therefore, it cannot fall into sin. This is where he differs from the theology of the Church. He kept this doctrine to the end. But in reality the soul does sin. Fragment II speaks of the impurity of the human heart. Valentinus' introspection must have gone too deep, in order to call the human heart an inn where impure spirits abide. This is already the method of the Desert fathers of the Christian Church and the precursor of modern psychoanalysis.

If man sins, Sophia must err too. She first was alienated from God and this explains our alienation. Conversely her return is our restoration. Actually Sophia has a twofold movement, one upwards

and another downwards. Paul's teaching on the two laws and human experience of the good and evil that operates within us would enhance such a doctrine.

Once the sinfulness of man and of Sophia was admitted, it remained to define sin. Here Valentinus deviates altogether from Christian tradition. Sin is a hypostatized entity. It is an idea not just a quality. An Aristotelian would speak of sinners, Valentinus speaks of sin. Paul precedes Valentinus on this road. Sin, therefore, can be separated from man as dirt from the body. It is a pollution, not a guilt.

This is exactly what our heavenly counterpart, Sophia, has done. She threw away from her ignorance and passion. These became hypostatized entities, but Sophia herself was purified.

Sophia suffered a loss, the dispersion of her own substance and she ascended to the eighth heaven waiting there for the consummation. This would coincide with the recollection of the scattered spiritual substance and the destruction of the material world.

All this is not a mere history of an idea, but the psychology of Valentinus as well. It shows the way Valentinus saw his own origin and destiny as identical to the origin and destiny of Sophia. And to this was intrinsically related the problem of the origin and destiny of the whole universe. In the spiritual and intellectual experience of Valentinus, one single myth became the means by which he tried to explain everything. In this he succeeded, in a genuine Platonic way, to reduce the many into one, the multitude of the problems involved in religion and philosophy into a single story.

The Fall of Sophia and the Sin of Valentinus

This reduction to unity explained how Valentinus himself could still be the same man, and at the same time a split individual who in succession had passed from two different stages of existence from sin to grace. Sophia was also one, in spite of her fall and repentance, and the scattering and ultimate regathering of her substance. Sophia was the "Pneuma" that is in man who passes herself through all the phases of the fall and redemption of man.

This individualization of Sophia in each man and in Valentinus did not present any difficulty for Valentinus. The background of Valentinus is sapiential. In the Wisdom books Sophia is a hypostasis of God, a universal wisdom and law, and also reason in man. The Logos philosophy, also, was a reconciliation of the one and the many. It was at the same time Logos and logoi. The identity of man, on the other hand, was a peculiar conception in Valentinus' time.

Man was one and at the same time a complex being, a kind of onion with a series of skins, and the one surrounding the other. The soul on its course down to earth invests the qualities of the various planetary spheres such as sex, belligerence, etc., as successive robes that divests on her reascent and finally enters the divine realm naked. The actual unit is the naked soul.

Valentinus even unified his conception of this. The planetary spheres are a derivative of Sophia. Actually she is the originator of passions.

Behind the several passions of Sophia we have a single passion. Here again we have the unifying spirit of Valentinus at work.

The passion, par excellence, of which the other passions are single manifestations, is Ignorance. Ignorance of what? Valentinian sources speak of the Ignorance of the Father or of the supreme God.

Ignorance, however, is not a lack of rational comprehension of the Father because the latter is before hand impossible. The vast profundity and unsearchable nature of the Father as well as His unspeakable greatness are incomprehensiveness. He lives in silence, and only his own Nous or Monogenes[1] took pleasure in contemplating him, and exulting in considering his immeasurable greatness. To all other aeons, He was invisible. The incomprehensibility of the Father is a well-known hellenistic subject--that of the Unknown God. This doctrine is the source of negative theology which survived both in Scholastic and Mystical Theology of the Christian Church. Ignorance is the failure to realize this single fact that the Father is beyond comprehension.

This comprehension was more than a rational approach to the first cause which has no beginning. It included a "pleasure," and enjoyment of the "sweetness" of God. It is the beatific vision itself. The Nous or Monogenes meditated to communicate the Greatness of the Father to the rest of the aeons and to create within them a desire of investigating his nature, but was prevented by the aeon Σιγή or Silence. These already had this desire, but in a quiet way. Actually the passion began with Nous and Aletheia, the first couple of aeons that originated from the original couple, Father and Ennoia (or Abyss and Silence). That means that it goes back to the very first level of the individual existence of the aeons.

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. ii. 1.

While the desire of the other aeons was quiet, for Sophia, the youngest aeon, it was violent. She rushed forth in advance of the rest of the aeons and suffered passion apart from the embrace of her consort, Theletos. Under the pretense of love she acted in temerity. She had not enjoyed communion with the father, like Nous, and she desired to search into his nature.

On this point we may detect a Greek influence; one is the notion of Hybris. Sophia stretched herself above and beyond her own rank. The Epinomis[1] condemns the fear harbored by the Greeks: "it is a forbidden thing for mortality to concern itself with the study of divinity." Sophia was not a mortal being, but a divine emanation. Valentinus was human and Sophia reflects his passion.

The search of God was the passion of the time, as was the struggle for freedom against fate or the law of the planetary spheres. It was also the passion of Valentinus and Valentinianism. The endless researches and μαθήματα , mentioned by Irenaeus are an evidence that actually Valentinianism never succeeded in liberating itself from this passion.

A similar search for Valentinianism is on the origin and the destiny of man. Excerptum of Theodotus 78. 2 epigrammatically expresses the essence of Gnosticism in a circular form: Who were we? What have we become? Where were we? Where have we been thrown out? Towards what goal are we running? From where have we been redeemed (bought)? What is birth and what is rebirth? EV 22. 13-19 answers

---

[1]Raymond Klibansky (ed.), Plato, Philebus and Epinomis, trans. A. E. Taylor (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1956), p. 244.

this question in a positive way. He who possesses Knowledge, knows whence he is come and where he is going. He knows it even as a person who, having been intoxicated, becomes sober and having come to himself reaffirms that which is essentially his own. In other words, Knowledge of the self is knowledge of being from God and Gnosis is Epignosis. (This Knowledge is a guarantee of salvation.[1])

These questions were enough to stimulate a strongly emotional religious personality like Valentinus. Valentinus was a passionate investigator. His research was more than a cold, disinterested, rational and academic approach. His whole being was involved. His approach included psychological, as well as intellectual, problems.

Valentinus first had to face the intellectual problem of the First cause and of the root of everything to which there is no beginning.[2] Secondly, he was beset by the emotional problem of the "Sweetness" of the Father, the attraction of the mysterium fascinosum;[3] thirdly, by the mystery of an unknown and unknowable God, namely by the impossibility of theological knowledge. These tensions were sufficient enough to create storm in the depth of his mind and soul. We can follow this storm by looking once more into the passion of Sophia to which Valentinus projected it.

---

[1]H. C. Puech, Le Manichaisme: son fondateur, sa doctrine (Paris: Publications du Musée Guimet, 1949), p. 71; cf., Puech, Quispel, and Malinine, pp. xv-xvi.

[2]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 2. 1.

[3]Rudolf Otto, Das Heilige (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936), p. 40 seq.

Sophia aimed at the impossible and thus became involved in an extreme agony of mind on account of the unknowability of the Father and of her love for him. Horos, which supports all things in their limits and individual existence, prevented her dissolution and brought her back to herself. Now Sophia is convinced that the Father is incomprehensible. This is her and Valentinus' knowledge: that the Father cannot be known. This is her and his repentance and restoration.

Irenaeus at this point closes the discussion of i. 2. 2, but immediately goes to paragraph 2 of the same chapter. Here he develops in every detail the "fabulous" description of the passion and restoration of Sophia. It is exactly this fable which has a high psychological significance for the reconstruction of the psychology of Valentinus.

At this point Irenaeus contrasts the "they" of the beginning of the chapter to "others" of paragraph 2. The various accounts reflect the same myth as Valentinus elaborated it on the pattern of his own experience. The myth itself presents certain slight variance in the description of the passions of Sophia and their causation. However, we must allow for a certain amount of rationalization and further elaboration, especially in the stage of the transmission of the myth through oral tradition.

According to Irenaeus[1] Sophia, in her failure, brought forth an amorphous substance, and on account of the latter's imperfection, she experienced grief.

---

[1]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 2. 3.

Her second feeling was fear for her own survival. On this she fell into complete perplexity endeavoring to discover the cause of all this. Finally, she tried to return to the Father presenting her supplication to the Father along with those of the other aeons, and of Nous in particular. Thus, material substance had its beginning from ignorance, grief, fear, and bewilderment.

Paragraph 4 speaks of the separation of the Enthymesis of Sophia from her and the further separation of the material substances from Enthymesis.

Chapter 4. 1 refers to the transactions of the Exopleromatic Enthymesis of Sophia or Achamoth. She became violently excited in those places of darkness and vacuity of the lower regions of the world. Here she suffered grief because of her failure and of fear for her life. Her ignorance is different from that of her mother, the Upper Sophia. The latter's ignorance was due to the degeneracy brought to her by passion; the former's was a result of innate opposition to knowledge. Evil, in this case, is far more advanced and assumes a devilish character as an opposition to good.

The duplication of Sophia may correspond to a further lapse of Valentinus into his own passions and degeneracy. Thus, he can be aware of the existence of a second nature in him that opposes knowledge and he can compare the human heart to an inn where evil spirits have free entry.[1] This deep darkness, however, is the kind of darkness which precedes the dawn. What follows is the repentance of both Valentinus and of Achamoth.

---

[1]Valentinian Fragment II.

Before going into the theme of the repentance of Sophia, we must ask the question once more: What is the nature of the sin and of the conversion of Sophia and, by implication, of Valentinus?

The Gospel offers us a clue to the Valentinian definition of sin. In the same manner of the negative confession included in the Egyptian Book of the Dead, the Gospel of Truth gives a list of sins that the Valentinians have not done: "even though they had not been deprived of the Glory of God. They did not elevate themselves, neither did they think of Him as being small, bitter, or irascible."[1]

To think of God as small is to assert that he can be limited and comprehended. This, however, was the capital sin of Sophia. She thought of him as being comprehensible. This, in all probability, was the sin of Valentinus also. He, like his contemporaries, engaged feverishly to the understanding of the unknowable God who remained in the darkness of mystery. This was a bitter experience for the researcher who might go through various stages of disappointment and despair. Once he was convinced that God was not small enough to be comprehended he could think of him as being bitter and irascible, hiding himself from men, as the God of Israel hid his face from Moses. In terms of Greek religious experience the search included τάλμην and ὕβριν and Valentinus could have believed that he was under the wrath of an angry God. He was familiar with the Jewish notion of a jealous and vindictive God who punishes the sins of the fathers in the generations to come. Finally, he could have been tempted to give up all inquiry for skeptical agnosticism and indifference.

---

[1] EV 42. 5-8.

On the practical side EV,[1] in the same negative way, asserts that the Gnostics experience neither envy nor lamentation. God's envy for human excellence is a very well-known Greek religious idea. Envy is meaningless as applied to man in relation to God; therefore, it must refer to former human relations which now have been perfected. Is this an allusion to Valentinus' loss of the Roman throne? Did he lament for his failure?

The positive aspect of the confession is that God is absolutely good, unshakable, sweet.[2]

Valentine thought of God as στερεός and as good. The former may refer to the unchangeability of God. His search did not provoke his wrath, but did not affect him either. He is too transcendant to be reached, yet he is sweet and good.

The goodness of God may be the very essence of the conversion of Valentinus. After all, Sophia's conversion lies in the fact that she finally realized that God is incomprehensible. Convinced of his goodness she supplicated for help. The Father sent Christ to her rescue. The incomprehensibility and the goodness of the Father are glaring features of the repentance of Sophia and Valentinus may have returned from Skeptical Agnosticism to the Agnosticism of Negative theology knowing just one thing: that God makes himself known only through his Son who is the face of the Father. Thus the Christian doctrine of Incarnation was the answer that Valentinus gave to the problem of the unknowability of God.[3]

---

[1] EV 43. 19. [2] EV 42. 7-8.

[3] This statement is compatible even with a docetic conception

The Restoration of Sophia and the Repentance of Valentinus

Achamoth separates herself from the collection of passions which became the substance of the matter from which this world was formed. These passions are now her desire of returning to the Father, and terror, sorrow, grief, perplexity on account of being left alone in the midst of darkness, and vacuity. To this corresponds joy and laughter on her reflecting on the light that had abandoned her, and then again terror, consternation, and bewilderment.[1]

All these passions betray a confused soul. Why should the heavenly Achamoth have experienced all these things apart from the experience of the author who put so much stress on them? Irenaeus builds his irony on the whole myth, but we may as well build an interpretation of the complexes of Valentinus. The combination of laughter to such a dark complex of feelings highly recalls the romantic laughter of self-observation.

Ignorance of what should be known as the supreme goal of man; uncertainty, despair, confusion and loneliness within a strange and inimical universe; rejection of this world as an illusion and as a malicious copy of truth meant to lead man astray from the true being; and longing for return were matched only by the solution that Valentinus gave to his own problem. The repentance of Sophia and himself.

The premises of the whole psychological structure are still

---

of the incarnation, since even in doceticism God somehow reveals himself, in spite of the fact that only the non-docetic form of the doctrine manifests the full extent of the love of God for mankind. Doceticism curtails the doctrine of the incarnation but it does not obliterate it altogether. The assumption of a phantom body is a means of self-disclosure of God to man.

[1]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i, ii, iv. 2.

the same, but new conclusions are derived from them. God is still unknowable and unknown. But He reveals himself through the Monogenes. Under one form or name or another, there is in the Valentinian sources an aeon which stands in a unique closeness to the Father and aims just at one single purpose, namely, at the revelation of the Father to the world. The Gospel of Truth calls him the Face of the Father,[1] or Son.[2] The excerpta of Theodotus call him Monogenes and give him quite an exceptional position.[3]

Thus the Monogenes reveals, not the depth, the greatness, or the incomprehensible nature of the Father. Valentinus' special message on the nature of God is that the Father is good.[4] All we know about the unknown Father is that he is Good.

This, of course, makes Valentinus a Christian, but he loses this specifically Christian element by equating the nature of the human soul to the divine substance, thus distorting all that we know about Biblical anthropology and soteriology. Even the Monogenes' unique position is forgotten since the latter's consubstantiality to the Father is shared now by aeons and men alike. He rejects the world and most of mankind, but he considers himself and his sectarian brothers as divine, saved by nature, not by grace.

This solution, however heretical it may be, was the only one

---

[1] EV 19. 32; 34. 3; 33. 41.

[2] EV 24. 14; 27. 13; 30. 31; 33. 39; 39. 7, 15, 24, 28; 39. 23, 26; 40. 25; 43. 22.

[3] EV 6. 2; 6. 3; 7. 1; 7. 3; 7. 5; 26. 1.

[4] Fragment II; Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. ii. 114. 3-6.

that satisfied the inquisitive spirit of Valentinus, it drew him out of confusion and despair and made him invulnerable to the illusion of the world and the terrors of Error and matter as being nothing. Now he belongs by right to the true world. It also enhanced his self-assertion against the heathen, Jews and Christians alike, and made him exactly what he came to be, an original heretical teacher and the universal pastor of a worldwide Valentinian Church. His experience of redemption reached the height of a translation to the world above.

Even though little is actually said about the experience of redemption of the author, we may surmise that it was an experience of translation to the Upper World, as in the case of the Odes of Solomon, where the actual experience of translation of the Odist is described in terms of rest, praise, worship, perfection, and spiritual delight.[1] Praise and rest are the final destiny of the Gnostic in Valentinianism in general, and in the Gospel of Truth in particular: "As for the rest, may they know, each in his own place, that it does not suit me, after having sojourned in the place of Repose, to say anything more."[2] The outcome of this experience is perpetual joy for the Valentinian. The Gospel of Truth is joy for those who have received the grace of knowing;[3] "He caused them to be joyful because of this discovery."[4]

Behind the sorrowful experiences of Valentinus and Sophia, and the multiplication of passions and of their explanations, we may

---

[1] OS xi. 17; xi. 21; xxxv. 5; xxxvi. 1; xxxviii. 4.

[2] EV 42. 39 - 43. 2. [3] EV 16. 1-3. [4] EV 18. 28.

discern just two fundamental psychological facts: ignorance and fear. The passions thus may be reduced to fear, the result of ignorance. For its study we must return once more to the Gospel of Truth.

The Pride of the Valentinians as the Corollary of the Valentinian Doctrine

The sense of pride is traditional among the Valentinians. Irenaeus informs us that they highly exalt themselves, and claim to be perfect, and the elect seed: ἑαυτούς δέ ὑπερυψοῦσι, τελείους ἀποκαλοῦντες... σπέρματα ἐκλογῆς [1]; "they call themselves 'the spiritual' and allege that they have already become acquainted with that place of refreshing which is within the Pleroma."[2] Irenaeus, referring to the Valentinian neophyte, states that "such a one is puffed up to such an extent, that he thinks he is neither in heaven nor on earth, but that he has passed within the Pleroma; and having already embraced his angel, he walks with a strutting gait and a supercilious countenance, possessing all the pompous air of a cock."[3] "Hence their sense of gravity of demeanor with a certain superciliousness."[4]

As a result of their arrogance, the Valentinians despised everyone who would not agree with them. The one who asks explanations or makes objections would be "of the intermediate regions," that is, of a psychic or animal nature. This one is deprived of the spiritual "seed [derived] from their Mother," Sophia.[5] The mem-

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 6. 4; i. 13. 4: "τελείους ἑαυτούς ἀναγορεύοντες."

[2] Ibid., iii. 16. 2; cf. EV 22. 1 on the author's sojourn in the place of repose.

[3] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. iii. 16. 2. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid., 15. 2.

bers of the Church at large are ἰδιῶται persons ignorant of this world, while the Valentinians are not of this world, but only live in it.[1] They proclaim themselves "perfect," so that no one can be compared to them with respect to the immensity of their knowledge. They assert that they themselves know more than all others,"and that they alone have imbibed the greatness of the knowledge of that power that is unspeakable . . . that they have attained to a height above all power."[2]

What makes this element of Valentinian psychology important is that it is not an accidental feature of their behavior but a necessary expression of their faith.

The Gnostics, and in particular the Valentinians, constitute an aristocratic minority. They are the elect who are predestined to salvation. Salvation, in turn, is not a gift but something natural to them. When the Valentinian awakens from the sleep of the common man and discovers himself, he discovers his own divinity. Hence, the sense of pride and arrogance. Humility has no place in their theological system, and the sweetness of the Father in the Gospel is sweet exclusively for the spiritual who are consubstantial to him, not for the sinners who are doomed to perdition with no hope of repentance and salvation.[3] Repentance (awakening from the sleep of ignorance of one's own divinity) is reserved only for the spiritual. It is a corrollary of the fundamental doctrine of the three natures that the spiritual alone can reach complete salvation. This has led Valentinian Bardaisan to abandon Valentinianism. He could not recon-

---

[1] Ibid., i. 5. 4. [2] i. 13. 6. [3] EV 33. 33; 42. 8.

cile himself with the idea that only few are saved and this by nature.

If pride and arrogance are inherent in Valentinian religion, it is evident that they were the qualities also of the man who formulated that religion. Thus, we are to examine the element of pride in Valentinus himself and see its psychological complications. This will lead us to a short survey of the life of Valentinus.

Irenaeus informs us that Valentinus "came to Rome in the time of Hyginus, flourished under Pius, and remained until Anicetus."[1] He came from Alexandria as a grown man and spoke Greek.

According to Tertullian, Valentinus was twice expelled from the Church of Rome. That means that he stayed in the Church for two different periods and that he was once restored.[2] His teaching should have been acceptable to the Church of Rome at least at the time of his restoration.

The Ecclesiastical Ambitions of Valentinus and the Church of Rome; the Date of the Gospel of Truth

Why did Valentinus leave the Roman Church? Tertullian informs us that he lost an episcopal election.[3] Was this election a rise to the episcopal presbytery or to the monarchical episcopacy?

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. iii. 4. 3.

[2] Tertullian De Prescriptione 30.

[3] Tertullian Adversus Valentinianos iv; cf. Pseudo-Tertullian Adv. omn. haer. xvii.

Harnack considers Pius the first monarchical bishop of Rome, and Pius became bishop in 140 A.D. This year, then, must be the year of the first defection of Valentinus, if he left the Church out of disenchantment for his failure to win the throne.

It is possible that his first defection was due to that cause. A forgiven person could hardly run for an ecclesiastical office. We know the austere attitude of the Church on the acceptance of the fallen Christians.[1]

His cancidacy, furthermore, should have fallen within the years of his "Orthodoxy." A forgiven heretic would equally have been excluded from that candidacy. A recently converted pagan, like Ambrosius of Milan, would have had more chances. Valentinus' first restoration, therefore, must have been a reconciliation with the ruling bishop for a possible personal clash. His second defection, the final one, must have been due to heresy.

Whether restored by Pius or earlier,[2] Valentinus reached the peak of his activity under Pius. If he left Rome when Anicetus became bishop,[3] then he must have had attracted his disciples in the years prior to the advent of Anicetus. This means that he must have developed his sectarian teachings at about the same time.

Irenaeus reports that Polycarp brought back to the fold followers of Valentinus on his visit to Rome in A.D. 154, for the ques-

---

[1]See the Shepherd of Hermas on the last chance of Repentance and also the debate between Hippolytus and Collistus on the problem of the restoration of Christians who had fallen into sin.

[2]In the event he ran for the office of a bishop presbyter. On this see Grobel, p. 28, n. 27.

[3]Ca. 154.

tion of Easter, the year Anicetus became bishop, and we must allow a certain number of years for the development of his teaching. Valentinus, then, actually flourished under Pius, when he developed his teaching and drew his disciples.

These dates have a bearing upon the problem of the date of the composition of the Gospel of Truth, as well as the locality.

There is internal and external evidence our writing was written in the West. Irenaeus refers to the parable of the lost sheep, the Left-Right substantial distinction between matter and spirit; and the counting by hands.[1] The same parable in exactly the same sense occurs in EV 32. 8-9.

Irenaeus also refers to the existence of the Gospel and of the time of its composition.[2] Irenaeus wrote by the year A.D. 180. He thinks that the Gospel was written not long before. His time perspective is based on the time of the compositions of the canonical gospels which, as written by the apostles, should have been written a century earlier. As Grobel remarks, Irenaeus' statement must mean a period of time less than fifty years.[3] This leads us to the late forties.

At this point we must consider two important facts. First, the Gospel of Truth is a homily on a Gospel Poem, secondly, it related to Baptismal liturgy. The significance of both should not be underestimated for their bearing upon the problem of its composition.

It is probable that the Valentinian catechumenes, and also

---

[1] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. iii. 24. 6.

[2] Ibid., iii. 2. 9.

[3] Grobel, p. 27.

the "perfect" ones, knew by heart the Gospel Poem which their teacher commented upon freely. It follows that the Gospel Poem is earlier than the homily and contemporary to the organization of the Valentinian community.

Since there is ground, on the other hand, to believe that the Gospel was meant to be used in Valentinian liturgy in connection with Baptism, the Gospel presupposes the existence of an organized sectarian Valentinian Church in Rome with full liturgical development. It is possible that Roman Christians who had supported Valentinus for the papacy followed him in his new community, and since Valentinus "flourished" under Pius, in Irenaeus' ironical sense, we may assume that his heretical activity, the composition of his poems and books and the organization of the Valentinian Church fall in the time of Pius (140-154 A.D.).

In 154 A.D., Polycarp in Rome was converting Valentinians back to Christianity.[1] On the other hand, he refers to the desertion of some Valentinians whose chrism is annihilated and they become empty vessels.[2] These could be restored again since the Father refills them (line 34). The restoration may refer to the return of those who joined the Roman Church through Polycarp's efforts, and who again lapsed into Valentinianism. If this is the case, the Gospel must have been written after the year 154 A.D., but in all probability on the basis of oral material, which goes back to Valentinus' Roman residence under Pius. The "refilling" section belongs, then, to Anicetus' time. This also explains the words of Irenaeus: he

---

[1] EV 36. 13-35.

[2] EV 36. 23-25.

"remained until Anicetus." They mean until after Anicetus. These data fix the date of writing.

The departure of Valentinus from Rome may be due either to serious damages done to the Valentinian community because of the intensive missionary activity of Polycarp and the Roman Church (and in this case the field of Valentinian activity was transferred to the Rhône Valley, in Southern France), or to dissentions within the Valentinian community itself. In Patristic literature, Valentinus appears overshadowed by his disciples. Ptolemy and Heracleon remained in the West, while Theodotus installed himself in Alexandria.

This short account of Valentinus' life and activity reveals a man who ran for an office and failed, and also created a sectarian group under a sectarian creed, to which he gave a poetical form.

Boldness and audacity, therefore, were the characteristics of Valentinus. He undertook the challenging enterprise of explaining to the world in terms of his personal experience and thrusting his doctrine in opposition to the creed of his community. In the field of action, he showed great ambitions and antagonistic tendencies. Hippolytus gives us an idea of the significance of the See of Rome to an ambitious person (Kallistos in this case).[1]

Valentinus' presumption, on the other hand, was not rooted in the vacuum, but on real ability. Tertullian presents him as a man of talent, eloquence and ability, but talent has its jeopardy and temptations.[2]

---

[1] Hippolytus Refutatio 9. 7, 11, 12.

[2] Δημητρίου Μπαλάνου, Ἰσίδωρος ὁ Πηλουσιώτης (Ἀθῆναι: 1922), pp. 143-156.

We have seen Valentinus' activity as that which betrays an ambitious man. However, this is only one aspect of his psychology. We must now see the anticlimax.

The Anticlimax: Retreat in Despair

Pride and fear may go together. Fear and anxiety are the anticlimax of the feeling of superiority which misses its goal. The higher the goal, the more painful the landing.

Valentinus left Rome when Anicetus became bishop. He went out of a city which refused to accept him as the leader of its Christian community. Epiphanius informs us that he taught and died in Cyprus, i.e., neither in his native land nor in Rome. Being a failure in Rome, he could not have been the glory of his native land. In all probability he went into self exile, near Alexandria, Egypt, but not on Egyptian soil. All this means pessimism and disappointment.

It has also been maintained that Alexandria, not Rome, was the city that refused to accept him as a bishop. That means that he was a candidate for the throne of that city and not for that of Rome. The difficulty of this view lies in the fact that the earliest bishop of Alexandria, Demetrius, is mentioned for the first time by the end of the second century, i.e., a generation after Valentinus' eclipse from the scene.

Whatever the case may be, the fact remains that Valentinus exchanged the tumult of the Imperial Capital for the peaceful life of an obscure provincial teacher. Was he longing for rest during his aggressive years? The term "rest" became one of the favored technical

expressions of his system. It means spiritual rest; therefore, we may guess that peace of mind was something the fighter had dreamed up in the midst of his battles.

We know that he left enthusiastic followers behind him in the West.

One of his major interpreters and systematizers, Ptolemy, lived and taught in the West and became the leader of a Western or Italian Valentinian school of thought, as contrasted to the Oriental one. Valentinus could not stay as a leader even among his own in the West.

We must remember again his rejection by the Roman Church. Hippolytus, too, had claimed the papal See but he fought under the banner of Roman Orthodoxy during the reign of three consecutive popes. After his death, he was recognized by Pope Damas as a presbyter and martyr of the Roman Church. What made this Church cast Valentinus out for a second time?

If the time of the final commitment of Valentinus to Heresy is not known, we must admit that his controversial personality is the result of a long struggle and antagonism. Rome was at that time the battle ground of various heresies. All heretics claimed Rome as their battlefield. Valentinus lived his antithesis to the Roman Church as a major part of his religious experience. In Rome, on the other hand, he had the chance to complete his "ecumenical" education, which should have been already rich enough from his Alexandrian background. The shadow of Marcion had not yet withdrawn from the Intellectual arena of Roman Christianity, and lesser heretics were working

there with zeal, the Ophites being among them.[1] How could Valentinus remain unaffected by these currents to the end?

On the other hand, the spiritual explosion of a strong religious personality is the outcome of a long process and its major trends should be traced back to the formative years of his youth. What do we know about the youth of Valentinus? Practically nothing. If, however, the Gospel of Truth is his work, as the author believes, it offers us a clue which explains both the disturbed personality of Valentinus and also his age when he had the nightmare experience.

Does the author of the Gospel of Truth belong to the psychological type of a heretic? Is he, too, like Valentinus, a sectarian teacher? His reference to the "true brothers" at the end of the tractate hint the existence of a certain sectarian conventicule to which the author is devoting his pastoral care.[2]

These are the children of the Father. They are perfect and worthy of his name.[3] Who are these true brothers? To whom are they contrasted? Why is the author supposed to keep silence on the place of rest? Who are those who are not supposed to hear about it?

The conclusion of the Gospel of Truth strongly reminds us of the Valentinians, as described by Irenaeus. They, too, are perfect, pleromas, children of God, true brothers; they have embraced the head of the Father; they devote themselves to themselves; they are above death. The author belongs to that group as a pastor of his flock.

---

[1] Tertullian Adversus Valentinianos iv.

[2] EV 43. 5.

[3] EV 43. 21.

The Author of the Gospel of Truth and Pride

After this description of Valentinian pride, the ambitions of Valentinus, and the sectarian activities of the author of the Gospel of Truth, we are prepared to make some remarks on the psychology of pride against the background of patristic moral theology. The nightmare of the EV will give us valuable material.

It is a living tradition among the monks of Mount Athos today that flight in a dream betrays an arrogant person. I am not in a position yet to trace this tradition back to its patristic sources, but I believe it is a part of the teaching of the fathers of the desert, the so-called " νηπτικοί πατέρες."

These unsophisticated and practical men, in their search into the realm of human motivation and into the dark intentions of the human heart, can be considered as the forerunners of the method of psychoanalysis. Under best appearances of human virtue, sometimes, they discover either egotistical or sexual motivations. They constantly observed and analyzed their own psychological complexes and the complexes of those who went to them for spiritual help.

It is a common fact, on the other hand, among the Greek fathers that heretics in general were proud and arrogant people. Arius' heresy, for instance, is attributed to pride by Epiphanius who relates that the old Alexandrian priest came into conflict with bishop Alexander of Alexandria "ἀπροσόπτῳ ἐπάρματι ἀρθείς ὁ γέρων ."[1]

Observation confirms this view. The heretic asserts himself.

---

[1]Epiphanius Panarion 69. 3.

He has the courage to face his whole community, to debate, and to promote controversy which further fosters his self-assertion. He opposes his own interpretation to the interpretation of his opponents and the Church. The defense of a new heretical doctrine is not the task of people of mediocre presumption. An heretical leader's arrogance can be compared to the triumphant pride of an authoritarian bishop. Isidorus'of Pelusion complaints against his own local bishop are instructive in this area.[1]

If we will compare the author of the EV to St. Paul, we may draw a useful lesson. Paul, too, had an experience of translation up to the third heaven.[2] No Valentinian would even consider a translation to such a low heaven which was the abode of the Psychic Demiurge.[3] While on earth, on the other hand, Paul had a strong sense of the presence of Christ in his life[4] followed by a deep sense of humility and gratitude. He knows his credentials, but only in case of absolute necessity and " ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ" he can refer to them.[5] Otherwise he only boasts in his weakness and infirmity[6] as well as in his sufferings and tribulations.[7] For Christ and the Church he is a stillborn.[8]

He knows that he is endowed with the Holy Spirit,[9] but the Spirit of God is an undeserved gift for him, not the essence of his

---

1 Δημητρίου Μπαλάνου, Ἰσίδωρος ὁ Πηλουσιώτης , (Ἀθῆναι,1922),σ. 143-156.

2 II Corinthians 12:2.

3 Irenaeus Adv. Haer. ii. 30. 7.

4 Galatians 2:20.

5 II Corinthians 11:21.

6 II Corinthians 11:9.

7 Colossians 1:24.

8 I Corinthians 15:9.

9 I Corinthians 7:40.

nature. The Old man, the man of sin and his law is still operating in his members,[1] but now he is a slave of Jesus Christ and a new creature by grace.[2] By no means will St. Paul consider himself a part of the divine substance, a member of the Pleroma, even though he is a member of the mystical Body of Christ as a wild branch that has been grafted to the good Olive tree.[3] He is not saved by nature, but by grace. No wonder, therefore, that he is working his own salvation with fear and trembling.[4]

The author of our document also refers to his ascension to the Pleroma, or the place of rest. Now, however, both he himself and his followers are "the truth, and the father is in them, and they are in the father" since they are perfect and inseparable from him who is truly good.[5] Irenaeus would say on their behalf that grace for them is a special possession, that they have received from above on the basis of the mystery of conjunction, while for the members of the Church at large, it was given for the purpose of use only.[6] This Valentinian statement makes the whole difference between St. Paul and Valentinianism. Grace for Paul is an additional gift that regenerates the old man. It is not the new man himself. For Valentinianism, relapse into sin is impossible because by nature the Gnostic, whatever he does, cannot sin. Irenaeus i. vi. 2 mentions the impossi-

---

[1]Romans 7:23. [2]II Corinthians 5:17.

[3]Romans 11:24. [4]Philippians 2:12.

[5]Robert M. Grant, Gnosticism: A Source Book of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), p. 160.

[6]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 6. 4.

bility of change of the nature of gold, if this is fallen into filthy water.

Valentinus as the Author of the Gospel of Truth

Such an experience is the natural result of a stormy life, both in the metaphysical, the religious, and the practical field. Here we meet a personal drama which is more real than that of Sophia herself. We are confronted with a tragedy which is more touching than the tragic myth of Valentinus reported by Tertullian. Actually the myth is an effort to say what the man has experienced within his innermost being.

The elements of this experience, which may be characterized as a perpetual crisis in the life of a real man with sharp and mild phases, is a combination of fear and anxiety, aggressiveness and retreat, audacity and despair combined with occasional relief that the author calls rest and perfection. These major antitheses of psychological situations became the cornerstone for the erection of a daring but coherent, systematic and unified system which aimed at the explanation of the whole universe. This system made a sectarian out of a man who otherwise had the sincere ambition to serve the Christian cause.

The author is very reserved in the use of myth. Myth, however, already used by Plato--one of the predecessors of the author of EV--served as a useful vehicle of expressing theory which otherwise would be incomprehensible to the masses. Plato, for instance, did not need the figure of a Demiurge for his system, since matter for him is eternal. The existing cosmogonic theories of the times, such

as those of Hesiod, the Orphic, the Pythagorean, and others conveyed their message in terms of a myth. Plato followed them in this by introducing a non-necessary element into his system. Thus, to the process of "demythologierung" corresponds a process of "mythologierung."

What makes our author peculiar is that in the myth he portrays the actual enactment of religious rites that he borrowed from the Christian Church and, perhaps, from the pagan mysteries. Thus, he correlates theosophy, myth, and liturgy at the same time.

After this investigation which combines history and psychology with history of doctrine based on literary sources, we may once more ask the crucial questions: Who is the author of the Gospel of Truth? What relationship can exist between the latter's author and and Valentinus?

The answer to this question has already been given on the basis of the comparison that has been made between the second tractate of the Jung Codex and these sources. A theory was elaborated with the starting point of a single common element of primary importance which permeates all these sources, i.e., the element of fear and anxiety, with its side effects and its relationship to Ignorance as a psychological and cosmological factor.

This element of fear has been of primary importance for the myth of Sophia. We have seen it at work in the sources that Quispel has used. These sources, with their philological elaboration by scholars of world-wide fame in more than a half a century, point to the same effect. Sagnard, one of the most recent workers on the

literary aspect of the Valentinian sources, offers it together with the elaboration of the text of Irenaeus, that he epigrammatically calls "Grande Notice, and the text of Hippolytus, that he calls text B and utilizes as a check to the former. Above all, the crucial Fragment I, an undisputed Valentinian document, and the Gospel of Truth, a work of the same Valentinus by hypothesis, put an emphasis on fear and anxiety, the first in connection with animal fear of the psychic nature, the second as a cosmic element involved in the process of the appearance of matter. Since, however, matter is inanimate and, therefore, cannot experience fear, this source also presupposes the existence of an animal nature as a result of fear which stamps it.

This single element with its various interrelations constitutes the connecting link between the Valentinian documents, on the one hand, and the Gospel of Truth on the other. It also constitutes a bridge between the Gospel of Truth and Valentinus himself. Here, Ignorance, Error, Fear, and the material world make a single process, since each one of them is the result of its precedent.

On the basis of the above data, the author believes that he is entitled to draw his final conclusion. It consists in the simple fact that this study has brought to light: the man who made the common myth of Sophia his own, the author of the fragments and especially of Fragments I and VIII, the poet of the Gospel Poem and its commentator in the Gospel of Truth are one and the same man; he is the man who, according to Hippolytus, composed a tragic myth after he experienced a vision of the Christ Logos. This man is none other than Valentinus.[1]

---

[1]Hippolytus Refutatio vi. 42. 2.

CONCLUSION

The discovery of the Gospel of Truth and is identification as a Valentinian work gives the students of Gnosticism, and in particular of Valentinianism, a first class source of information for their research. The attribution of this source to Valentinus himself brings us to the original source of Valentinianism before it became overmythologized and was transformed in the hands of disciples of the subsequent generations. It also reveals to us the personality of the man who, in the second century A.D., established his own Church which seriously rivaled the Church-at-large that eventually came to be known as Catholic Christianity.

Valentinus' work as a source of information is superior to anything we had known before from Patristic and other sources. Prior to that discovery, the historian had to use his ingenuity to disentangle the various strata of Patristic sources. These sources in most cases are composite and their very selection betrays the personal interest and point of view of their collectors. The disposition of the Church fathers against what they labeled as heresy is another drawback of these sources, in spite of the fact that the present status of research permits us to judge them more objectively and, therefore, to trust them more.

The primary sources that we now have at our disposal, the Gospel of Truth being a major one among them, give us the means to

study Valentinianism directly from its original source, i.e., from the writings of its founder.

The only drawback that such a primary source as the Gospel of Truth may present is that it was meant to be cryptic by its author, therefore, it intentionally passes silently over certain aspects of the Valentinian teaching. In this connection, the Patristic sources, which were written at a time when the secret doctrine of the sect had become common knowledge, are of special value to us and only by starting from their data can we read into the Gospel of Truth what lies between its lines.

From the day of publication the Gospel of Truth has been attributed to Valentinus, the founder of the Gnostic Church and theology which bore his name in the middle of the second century A.D. The best evidence to the Valentinian authorship of the document, therefore, would be the agreement between the teaching of that document and the doctrine of Valentinus; the reconstruction of that doctrine, however, is a problem in itself.

Quispel tried to reconstruct the "Original Doctrine of Valentinus" or at least its outline by combining several texts of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Hippolytus, he believed, has survived in the Ptolemaic part of the Excerpta of Theodotus which run parallel to Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 2. This, he maintained, represents an original writing of Valentinus and, therefore, the latter's teaching which includes both a systematic theology and a visionary conception of reality. Quispel's work is useful for the study of the various stages of development of the Valentinian school, but he himself has abandoned his general theory.

Sagnard attempted to reconstruct the Valentinian system of ideas on the basis of the sources available before the discovery of the Jung Codex and of the work done on the basis of them. He placed special emphasis on the Ptolemaic source of Irenaeus is reproduced by Hippolytus. Sagnard's method is somehow circular in character. He interprets his sources on the basis of the general Valentinian doctrine. Conversely, he formulates that doctrine on the basis of the same sources. His historical and philological emphasis, however, leads him to the constant verification of his results, and verification, even though based on deduction, is an evidence in itself, as long as it explains the facts.

The writer's foundation for the reconstruction of the original doctrine of Valentinus, is the small number of the surviving fragments of Valentinus himself. These fragments are out of context and isolated. However, they can be correlated to each other, to the main tenets of the general Valentinian theory and to the teachings of the Gospel of Truth. Thus they prove themselves to be very instrumental in showing the Valentinian character of the Gospel of Truth on the basis of the doctrinal agreements that exist between them and that document. Fragment I, in particular, became especially valuable for the study of the doctrine and psychology both of Valentinus and of the author of the Gospel of Truth.

The appearance and evolution of the Gnostic movement is a part of the general syncretistic movement which preceded the conquests of Alexander the Great, but found its full development in the Hellenistic and the Early Imperial ages. It consists in the blending of Greek,

Roman and Oriental elements which combined together in the city states of the hellenistic empires, and later in the melting pot of the universal state that Rome created. The elements are religious, philosophical, as well as generally cultural.

The study of the religious movements which led to the formation of Gnosticism is necessary to the understanding of the latter. Each tradition must be studied separately, and also in its connection to the Gnostic phenomenon. In turn, each Gnostic school must be studied on its own merit and linked to the sources from which it derives its existence. This can be done only on the basis of literary and other sources. The reconstruction of the general environment must be paired with the reconstruction of the particular milieu within which a certain Gnostic community arose. That means that in the case of the Gospel of Truth we cannot be satisfied with generalizations, but we must be specific in the establishment of the immediate influences upon Valentinianism, and in the description of the development of the faith and life of the Valentinian church. Thus Valentinianism is the meeting place of Christian, Jewish, and pagan ideas. The latter entered it either through Judaism or directly. Its immediate background, however, is Gnosticism, pagan, Jewish, and Christian.

The author of the Gospel of Truth is a dualist, both in a Platonic and in an Iranian sense. His Platonism consists in the acceptance of a real world that is above and of a phenomenal world below which is an imperfect copy of the superior level of existence. There is an essential difference, however, between Valentinian and Platonic dualism. The latter also knows an antithesis between two worlds, the

ideal and the actual, but considers the latter as a reflection and a copy, not a caricature of the world that the Gospel of Truth calls "Truth." It also professes that matter is eternal and, therefore, indestructible. The Gospel of Truth, on the contrary, believes in the necessity of the final destruction of matter. Not only matter but the whole "Form" of this world, the complete "Schema" and constitution of the visible universe is evil and, because of that, it will be the prey to the final conflagration at the end of time. Matter, thus, is not a mere resistance to form, as the resistance of the marble to the action of the chisel, but an active principle of Evil and both form and matter, i.e., the whole organized system of the lower world are doomed to perdition. The conception of the world, not merely as an imperfect structure but as an uterrly evil constitution, makes the dualism of the Gospel of Truth Iranian.

The author's conception of evil, however, ultimately fuses with Hindu Monism when he considers even Evil and its by-product--the material world--as an illusion which automatically disappears on the appearance of Truth. There is a major difference, however, between Valentinus and Hindu philosophy. While Hinduism accepts one single world whose illusionary appearance is the visible world, our document accepts three universes, namely, the spiritual, the animal or "psychic," and the material. In terms of origin this kind of pluralism can be reduced to Monism, since the two lower worlds are derivative of the superior world. Dualism, however, ultimately prevails due to the fact that after the annihilation of matter the "psychic" world will not be reabsorbed in the Pleroma, but will eternally remain at its gates, thus preserving its spearate existence.

According to this presentation Valentinianism is a blending of Platonic and Iranian dualism with Hindu monism. It combines without ultimate consistence, the ontological antithesis between form and matter to the moral contrasts between good and evil and the psychological distinction between illusion and reality. As such, it is a highly syncretistic system that expresses the tendencies of the period in which it flourished.

The original language of the Gospel of Truth was Greek. In spite of the fact that the text of the treatise has undergone two translations--the Coptic and one modern--the ancient Greek included, the vocabulary is still the same and in many instances it has been preserved intact by the Coptic translator who used the Greek terms in lack of Coptic equivalents. It also can be identified on the basis of the technical Valentinian terminology that the Coptic has included.

For the above reasons Ménard's retranslation of the Coptic into Greek was relatively easy but we must bear in mind that the Greek text reached by Ménard is highly hypothetical and that his method has all the merits and weak aspects of the retranslation of the books of the New Testament into Aramaic.

The text of the Gospel of Truth, as we have it today in its Coptic translation, is a composite text. It comprises a poem which, because of its content, can be labeled as a Gospel poem and a homiletical commentary to it.

The poem is buried within the text of the Gospel of Truth, but it can be isolated on the basis of the difference of style that exists between it and the other parts of the tractate, of the intro-

ductory particles to the poetical parts and of the transitions that link certain poetical sections to the commentaries that follow. It can be shown, also, by the fact that it can be recast into a poetical form.

Once the presence of poetry in the Gospel of Truth has been suspected, the obligation imposes itself to compare that poetry to a small "psalm" which Hippolytus attributes to Valentinus. This is Fragment VIII, known as the Harvest.

As far as content is concerned both the Harvest and the Gospel of Truth express as a whole the same Valentinian view of God and the world. The Harvest is a review of the whole cosmology of Valentinus, starting from the Divine Pleroma and ending with the material world in an unbroken chain of interdepending links, while the baby that hangs from the matrix is nothing else than the Logos of Fragment VII. The Gospel Poem, on the other hand, is a hymn to the Logos, interwoven with cosmology and eschatology.

In poetic form the two poems follow different courses. While Fragment VIII is written in the meters of ancient Prosody with possible concessions to the tastes of the day, the Gospel Poem is cast into accentual meters. These are predominantly iambic or trochaic, i.e., meters which for their simplicity were used by the common people during the period of transition from quantitative to accentual meters.

The metrical reconstruction that has been undertaken here is based on the fact that Valentinus knew and possibly imitated the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament which was the Bible of the early Church and which shows occasional traces of accentual meters.

The Gospel Poem also reveals Semitic metrical parallelistic influences, a fact that clearly shows that its author was familiar with Biblical poetry. Parallelism is common to the Harvest and to the Gospel Poem.

The fact that the poem is a Gospel is an answer to the problem of the literary character of the tractate. The poem has a joyous message to offer, the "good news" of the descent of the Logos. This Kerygmatic element is followed by didactic material and the two, message and instruction together, are constituent elements of the Gospel type of literature. The text includes beatitudes, admonitions, prohibitions, and parables, and thus reproduces in its own Gnostic way the Gospel type of literature. This also solves the problem of the title of the tractate. The incipit Gospel of Truth is also the title of the work.

The text of the Gospel of Truth is the work referred to by Irenaeus and Pseudo-Tertullian. Irenaeus contrasts the four Gospels to the Gospel of Truth, and considers the title of the Valentinian Gospel as a blasphemous assertion that the four Gospels are untrue. Tertullian attributes the Gospel to Valentinus himself, but in all probability both Irenaeus and Pseudo-Tertullian ignored the text of our document. The intention of the "Evangelist" is not to replace the four Gospels with his own but in the manner of the Johannine Prologue to celebrate the descent of the Logos.

The author presupposes the events of the historical life of Jesus but his concern is the Heavenly Christ that he identifies with Jesus and the Johannine Logos. Life upon earth for him is insignifi-

cant and history of no value. He, therefore, transposes actual history into supraterrestrial spheres. The author rejects the resurrection of the physical body and in all probability he has docetic tendencies in spite of the fact that he mentions the perishable rags of the body of Christ. Accordingly he asserts that Jesus was invested already with imperishability even before his crucifixion.

It is possible that the Gospel was not meant by Valentinus to be written at all, but that it was used as an oral communication to the catechumens as a part, probably an important one, of their preparation for Baptism. The cryptic character of the Gospel agrees with that point of view and has its counterpart in some of the secret societies of our day, where certain things are not supposed to be put into writing. It is possible that someone took notes of Valentinus' instruction while the master was speaking and put them into writing on the basis of memory not long after the lecture was delivered. After the Master disappeared from the active scene his absence was felt, and these notes became a valuable document of the Valentinian Church which continued to use them for her educational purposes. The fact, however, that Irenaeus did not have access to the Gospel, as he had to other sources, means that thirty years after its composition it continued to be kept out of circulation and it was cherished as an esoteric writing of the sect. Thus Irenaeus, by hearsay, could attribute it to the Valentinians, and Pseudo-Tertullian even to Valentinus himself.

The Poem might have served also the liturgical needs of the Valentinian Church and especially the rite of Baptism. The writer rejects the view that the Gospel of Truth is a confirmation homily

(Segelberg) and adopts the theory of Säve-Söderbergh that it constitutes a Baptism homily on the ground that there is no distinction between Baptism and Confirmation in the text of the Gospel, but one between the "psychic" Baptism of the Church and the "pneumatic" or spiritual Baptism of the Valentinian community. This Baptism included also anointment with oil as in the rite of Redemption described by Irenaeus. It is justifiable, therefore, to say that the Gospel served the catechetical and liturgical purposes of the Valentinian church. Like Cyril's "Catecheses" it prepared the candidates for church membership, for the sacrament of Valentinian Redemption which included not only Baptism, but Confirmation as well. It served, therefore, as a liturgical text for the Valentinian religious services, both for its Kerygmatic and its instructive portions.

The Gospel of Truth as a whole, poem and homily, is a production and a reflection of the Gnostic school of thought. It belongs to Christian Gnosticism of the second century A.D. as its doctrine and terminology make clear. It further can be classified as a work of the Valentinian school and, as the writers believe, of Valentinus himself.

The Valentinian character of the Gospel of Truth has been recognized by most students of the document except for Schenke and some other scholars who reject it without hesitation. Schenke considers the tractate as a general Gnostic work and the Valentinian vocabulary as general Gnostic terminology. His fundamental misconception is that he identifies the specific Valentinian terminology with the nomenclature of the Ptolemaic system which, of course, he

could not openly find in the tractate.

The specific Valentinian doctrines known from other Valentinian sources are presupposed, however, by the author of our treatise and can be read between the lines of his text. Thus the myth of Sophia, the notion of the Valentinian Pleroma, the doctrine of the three natures are implicit in its teaching. They are also presupposed by certain Valentinian formulas preserved by Irenaeus and Clement which serve as summaries of Valentinian doctrine and as confessions of faith. Viewed under this angle, the Gospel of Truth is not far removed from Ptolemaic Valentinianism even though it is not identical to it.

The document is also in agreement with the Valentinian fragments, a fact which brings it into close relationship not only with Valentinianism in general terms but with the person of Valentinus himself.

The Valentinianism of our author, however, is neither what has been called "proto-Valentinianism," i.e., a form of primitive Valentinianism without the notion of a developed Pleroma, nor the later type of the system known to us from such writings as the sources of the third century A.D., Pistis Sophia. It stands between the two extremes which evidences the well-balanced control that the master of the system could exercise upon the doctrine of the school. The details of the Pleroma, however, are intentionally kept by the author secret. So did the Essenes of the Dead Sea or the Therapeutae of the Lake Mareotis in Egypt with the names of the angels that they too kept secret.

The main subject of the tractate is the emergence of the Logos from the depths of the Father. Truth is the Logos and the Gospel of

Truth might well be called the Gospel of the Logos or the Gospel of Christ or of Jesus whom the author identifies with the Logos. The author's conception of the Logos can be traced to two sources, i.e., to the sapiential hypostatization of the Wisdom of God which occurs in the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament, canonical and deutero-canonical, and to the Johannine Logos. In contrast to his disciple Ptolemy, however, Valentinus strongly holds to the doctrine of the unity of the Logos, in spite of the fact that he also accepts emanations of the Truth or of the Logos. These are the logoi.

His Pleroma, which the writer believes is an expansion of the notion of the Christian Trinity, is still indivisible and the variety of names or aeons to which he alludes to are qualities of the Father, not independent hypostases as is the case for Valentinianism.

The Valentinian character of the Gospel of Truth, as said earlier, was denied by Schenke. Following Grant's suggestion, Schenke called the attention of the scholars to the similarities that exist between this tractate and the Odes of Solomon, but presented himself with a dilemma: the "so-called Gospel of Truth" must be either on the side of Valentinianism or on that of the Odes of Solomon, and since the former is not possible according to Schenke's premises, it belongs to the school of thought that produced the Odes.

This dilemma is definitely false because the Odes of Solomon are not in the opposite direction to Valentinianism but they stand on the borderline between that school and what we may call "Orthodoxy" of the early second century A.D. Some believe that Valentinus is the author of the Odes of Solomon and that he wrote them before he fell

into what the Church fathers labeled as his "heresy."

There exist striking similarities between the Gospel of Truth and the Odes of Solomon and certain features of the Valentinian Gospel are quite meaningless apart from the Odes. Such an example would be the mouth-to-mouth communication in the reception of the Spirit by the Valentinians which presupposes the background of the Odes, where the doves are thus feeding their nestlings.

Differences exist also between the two writings. In spite of the existence of Gnostic parallels to the vocabulary of the Odes some specifically Valentinian notions such as the notion of the Three Natures, the doctrine of the Pneumatic Seed, the Valentinian doctrine of Salvation as a natural possession are missing from the Odes. The Gospel Poem, that the writer has reconstructed in this dissertation, also betrays a poet whose temperament is different from that of the poet of the Pseudo-Solomon. Valentinus is a more sophisticated poet and deals with abstractions while Pseudo-Solomon is more spontaneous nad of a higher inspriation. The former belongs to the pessimistic atmosphere of the poetry of the Dead Sea Hymns while the outlook of the poet of the poet of the Odes is brighter. Both poets have experienced redemption but while Pseudo-Solomon is a regenerated being, a new creature, Valentinus, is even in his status of "rest" and "being in the Pleroma" a tragic physiognomy.

Thus there are similarities and probably interdependence between the two documents but these differ among themselves on essential points and, as a result, their authors cannot be one and the same person.

The doctrine of Valentinus is not a mere theoretical speculation but an expression of the inner experience of Valentinus rooted in the structure of his personality and interwoven with his actual story that he projects to the world as a whole. Thus, history, psychology, theology, and cosmology converge in to one point, the formulation of that doctrine as a coherent mythopoetical presentation both of his personal experience and of the story of the universe.

Fragment I mentions the fear that befell the angels on the discovery of the superior nature of man they had created who was endowed with reason and speech. Man, thus, was a reasonable being and therefore a being that surpassed the structure they meant to create. Reason and speech belong to the "Pneumatic" nature, the being the angels created in their own likeness is the psychic or animal nature, while the rest is the material man.

The element of fear permeates all the Valentinian sources and the Gospel of Truth. Fear is one of the passions of Sophia and derives from Ignorance. Valentinus' general emphasis on the element of Fear and Terror is significant. It must have something to do with the essence of his system.

A nightmare expresses both the psychology of the author and the experience of the man who holds to the ilusionary character of the existing World. When man takes cognizance of the illusionary character of the World he awakens from sleep and from the terrors of the Nightmare. The Nightmare has parallels in literature but it is also the personal experience of the author of the Gospel of Truth who, as an educated man, could have dreams expressing his literary background.

The mention of blood in the nightmare is significant for the detection of the age of the man who had the dream. Recent psychological study has shown that colored dreams are mostly experienced by young people between eighteen and thirty-three years of age. In our particular case it does not have an immediate bearing upon the age of the author, since we have no assurance that the latter put into writing his experience upon his awakening from sleep. We can assumed, however, that the dreamer was relatively young when he had his nightmare experience. If, on the other hand, the nightmare reveals the psychological complexes of the author, it is legitimate to assume that he was burdened with such complexes since the days of his youth and that, consequently, we are faced with a permanent trait of his personality.

In this study this particular psychology of Valentinus, which coincides with that of the author of the Gospel of Truth, became the basis for the elaboration of a new argument in favor of the identity of the two authors. The argument starts from the world above and ends with the author of the Gospel of Truth, having the myth of Sophia as its center.

The story of the passions of Sophia starting from Ignorance and ending with the shaping of the material world is well known. What is important for our purpose is that, on the basis of the Valentinian "law of reverse exemplarism," we are entitled to assumed that the passions of Sophia correspond to actual human experience which, in the case of Sophia, has been projected to the world above.

Valentinus is not the originator of the myth of Sophia, which

has its own prehistory in Jewish and pagan religious thought. It also appears in contemporary sources such as the Barbelognostics of Irenaeus, the Apocryphon of John, the Sethian Ophites of Irenaeus, etc.

In the story of its development, the myth of Sophia is related to human experience. The pagan goddesses it represents were one-time prostitutes upon earth and, in turn, the myth is applied to historical figures such as the person of Helen, the consort of Simon magus.

Valentinus made this myth central for his system, since under its symbolism he unified his whole conception of the Universe. While the myth has almost the same constituent elements in the sources, it occurs outside Valentinianism, in the system of Valentinus it becomes the key to the interpretation of the world. In the Gnostic sources that have been mentioned above, its role is secondary and illustrative.

The thesis of the writer is that Valentinus made the myth an expression of his own religious experience. That means that he made the passions of Sophia the very passions of Valentinus who, by its means, projected his own personal tragedy into the universe. What was wrong with him was wrong with the whole world. That makes Valentinus' system highly anthropocentric and a mere projection of his own emotions. At the same time it means that Valentinus lived the problems of the Philosophy of the Universe as his own personal problems. Religious Philosophy for him was not a mental exercise but an "Erlebnis."

Sophia is characterized by a double movement. She presents a downward and an upward tendency. These tendencies can be labeled as

Sophia's fall into sin and conversion. They correspond to the fall into sin and to the conversion of Valentinus himself.

The sin of Sophia and of Valentinus is the fact that they both attempted to know and understand the unknowable nature of the Father. The unknowability of God was a dogma for the Gnostic trend of hellenistic philosophy and corresponds to a pessimistic interpretation of the universe. The alternative trend was the conception of a "Cosmic God," who was considered to be responsible for the order and beauty of the universe. For Valentinus and his pessimistic fellow-travelers, the "harmony" of the world was the slavery of Fate and its order a creation of "Falsehood."

The effort to understand the Father included an element of audacity which, in terms of Greek religious experience, is "Hybris," namely, an insult to the divinity and an illegitimate transcendence of the limitations put upon human nature. The Father, however, exercises a double influence on Sophia and on Valentinus. He is the remote and unapproachable Unknown God of Gnosticism--the Mysterium Tremendum--but at the same time, the attractive and sweet Father, the Mysterium Fascinosum.

The results of the sin are catastrophic both for Sophia and the whole world, but also for Valentinus. Sophia falls into the lower regions of the universe, in the empty spaces of darkness and vacuity where terror and anxiety prevail. Valentinus, being unable to grasp the Unknown God, feels himself solitary and a stranger within an inhospitable universe. This is the source of Fear, Terror, and Anxiety for him. Occasionally he may have given up altogether all "re-

search" in favor of indifference, but this is temporary only. He returns to his quest and finally he finds the solution to his problem. God is Unknown and Unknowable but he is pleased to make himself known through the Son. The Son or Logos is the visible aspect of the Father, while his other nature remains inscrutable. The Logos reveals just one aspect of the father--his Goodness. For Valentinus, God is Good.

This is a specifically Christian element in the system of Valentinus but he transposes it easily from the realm of "Heilsgeschichte" to the eternal sphere of suprahistorical reality. Therefore, Valentinus' notion of the Incarnation is docetic, but it still constitutes the answer to his quest and, consequently, his "redemption." Thus Valentinus combines a Negative Theology, which leaves God in the silence of the Unknown, with the notion of the Incarnation modified in terms of Gnostic Doceticism.

The whole process reveals a disturbed personality with ups and downs of emotion. The psychology of Valentinus is also the psychology of the author of the Gospel of Truth. This document presents the shaping of the world in terms of the passions of a certain person, probably of Sophia, and these passions are derivative of Ignorance or Error and consist in Terrors and Anxiety.

The identity of psychology between the author of the Gospel of Truth and Valentinus is an evidence that Valentinus is the author of that document. Both are split personalities, and both live between the extremes of sinfulness and redemption. The connecting link between the two is the myth of Sophia which is implicitly present in the Gospel of Truth. Both men are socially active and bur-

dened with ambitions and frustrations; Valentinus with the unsuccessful effort to be elected a bishop or the Bishop of Rome, the author Gospel who still bitterly lives his antithesis to the untrue "brothers" with the responsibility of tending a sectarian flock. Both are proud of their "pneumatic" character which places them over and above the rest of mankind. Ultimately the two men are one, i.e., Valentinus.

APPENDIX

THE SPECIFIC VALENTINIAN USE OF THE MYTH OF SOPHIA ITS USE IN THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND BY VALENTINUS

The myth of Sophia is not a creation of Valentinus. It has its prehistory in Jewish and Gentile sources,[1] and occurs in contemporary sources such as the Barbelognostics of Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. i. 29, the Apocryphon of Johnm the Sethian-Ophite system described by Irenaeus in Adv. Haer. i. 30, etc.

The forms under which it occurs in the above sources are almost identical with its Valentinian use but this concerns rather the elements of the myth and not its organization. There is something that makes the myth unique in the hands of Valentinus and this is the fact that Valentinus makes it the pivot of the expression of his personal experience and of his cosmogony. This is the particular contribution of Valentinus in the Valentinian formation of the myth. The Sophia myth for him is central, while for the non-Valentinian sources where it occurs, it is peripheral or, at least, it does not explain the existence of the whole universe. To make this evident we must once more look into the Gospel of Truth and Valentinus himself.

---

[1]Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, pp. 53, 76-85, 135-36, 198, n. 40.

It has already been said that in the Gospel of Truth the myth of Sophia is not mentioned, but it lies in the background of the thought of its author. We are told, however, of the ignorance (of Sophia)"which produced Anguish and Terror. And Anguish became dense like a mist so that no one could see. For this reason Error was strengthened. It elaborated its own Matter in emptiness, without knowing the Truth. It applied itself to the modeling of a creature, trying to provide in beauty the equivalent of Truth."[1]

Ignorance here produces certain passions, namely, Anguish and Terror. Anguish is condensed and solidified. Error elaborated its own matter and proceeded to the modeling of the visible world, which was an imitation of the true world above.

Out of one single principle, which was the effect of someone (of Sophia), the whole visible universe with evil rooted in it is derived. Ignorance is not a mere emotion meant to embellish the story. It is a principle of deficiency within the divine nature that follows its course up to its last consequence, the creation of the world and, as the rest of the Gospel states, the ultimate eschatological return of the elect, and the destruction of the creature of Error.

The derivation of the world from the disturbances of Sophia is a dogma for the Ptolemaic source of "the Grande Notice" of Irenaeus[2] to whom Theodotus Excerptum 46. 1 and Hippolytus Refutatio 32. 5 agree.

As reality is divided into three parts--the spiritual, the

---

[1]EV 17. 9-21. [2]Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i, iv, and v.

psychic or animal, and the material--we are told that the last two natures and the constitution of the world and matter originated from Sophia. Sophia had two tendencies, one upward and another downward. The upward tendency which is also called conversion is the source of the psychic or animal nature and the Demiurge. Irenaeus in Adv. Haer. i, v. 4 mingle fear and conversion, but we must not press the text too much.

Section two of chapter iv tells us that the rest of this world is made out of the fear and grief of Sophia. Section four of chapter v is more explicit on the provenance of the visible world.

All material substance were derived from the three passions of Sophia, namely, fear, grief, and perplexity. The spirits of wickedness and the Cosmocrator (Devil) derived their origin from grief. The corporeal elements sprang from bewilderment and perplexity. The earth from stupor, water from agitation caused by Sophia's fear, air from the consolidation of her grief; fire was inherent in all of them. Section two of chapter iv derives all liquid nature from her tears and all that is lucent from her smile, all corporeal elements from her grief and perplexity, while all other things from her terror and sorrow.

These passions are placed by these sources before the creation of the world and after the expulsion of Sophia from the Pleroma. Then, she suffered grief and was delivered to every sort of that manifold and varied state of passion (section one of chapter iv). "At one time she would weep and lament on account of being left alone in the midst of darkness and vacuity; while, at another, reflecting on the light which had foresaken her, she would be filled with joy, and laughter;

then, again, she would be struck with terror; or, at other times, would sink into consternation and bewilderment (section two of chapter iv).

The process of solidification of passions into elements was gradual. Incorporated passions solidified into immaterial substances, and these, in turn, into actual bodies.

Passions, of course, are conditions of the human soul, but the Valentinians should have observed that they are followed by bodily secretions, such as tears, etc.

What is more important is that passions and matter are related to evil. This is natural, since, in the final analysis, they are the result of ignorance, which is Evil simply defined. Thus, not only the form of the world is a poor imitation of the world above, and therefore, something evil, but also its matter. Irenaeus repeats that the Valentinians "ex passione et ignorantia volunt substantism habuisse,"[1] and asserts his faith that matter was made by God.[2] This is his explanation of the "causa . . . mali."

What impresses us is that both form and matter are depreciated into something evil. This cannot be pure Platonism. According to Platonic tradition, Matter is the Nurse which receives the forms; as such, it serves a purpose, and the Platonian definition of matter concerns all levels of existence which are susceptible to formation, and not just the material elements. Again, spirit is any level of existence which may form and organize its inferior level. On the other hand, matter, according to the same tradition, resists the

---

[1]Irenaeus. Adv. Haer. ii. 13. 7. [2]Ibid., ii, 28. 7.

form, as the marble resists the chisel. For Plato, Matter is eternal. Valentinian dualism goes deeper. Form and matter are evil, and behind matter we have passion. Iranian dualism can explain, to some extent, only Valentinian pessimism. After all, it was the fashion of the day. It may even explain the ultimate monism of the Valentinian speculation which derives all existence, good and evil, from God. Ahura Mazda and Ahriman, after all, were twin brothers. But what will explain Passion as the origin of matter and evil? Stoicism is not a satisfactory answer. It teaches the control over the passions not their complete abolition. We must, therefore, look to the Far East for its philosophy of the material world as an illusion, and even to Buddhism for its doctrine of passion as the root of suffering and for its gospel of the abolition of passion.

The passions of Sophia are essential to Valentinian Psychology and Cosmology. They occur, as has been said, outside Valentinianism, but there is a difference in the way they are looked upon outside and inside Valentinianism. We must see that difference, which is difference in perspective, since the elements of the myth are the same but its position in the respective cosmological system is different in Valentinianism, being central elsewhere secondary.

Sophia as a mediator of creation between the supreme god, and the lower Demiurge is common to Valentinianism, Barbelognosticism, the Apocryphon of John, and the Ophites. Without Sophia there would be no lower world.

The fall of Sophia with its subsequent repentance and rescue by a divine emissary from above is also common to all of them.

Even the passions of the fallen Sophia is a common theme. In the Sethian Ophite system, there is even mention of the solidification of the desire of Ialdabaoth into Ophis after he looked in despair and grief down on the dregs of matter. The material elements, however, are there before the descent of Sophia. Below the Father of All, the Son of Man and the Holy Spirit, are the various elements--water, darkness, abyss, chaos[1]--which eventually imprison Sophia Prunicos in a watery body. Sophia is not their creator. They are not the solidification of the passions of Sophia which are there, but for a different purpose. They were there before Sophia came into the picture.

In the Apocryphon of John, Sophia repents and laments. This, however, takes place after Ialdabaoth's boasting exclamation over a completed stage of world creation. The passions of Sophia are introduced too late to be the cause of the world. They are just an episode which under this form is secondary to the Valentinian myth.

We must attribute the structure of the Valentinian myth of Sophia to a single mind. The man who brought the ontological and moral problem of the world into a common denominator, the Fall and Passion of Sophia, and this ultimately to a deficiency within the divine nature itself, was in the final analysis a monist, not a dualist. Dualism under its various forms of Form-Matter, Good-Evil, Above-Below are intermediary stages of a long process which starts from the same source, God. He manages to unify the contradiction of existence under one single myth: the Fall of Sophia, but this fall was the fall of divine substance itself.

---

[1]Genesis 1:2.

We have seen this myth operating behind the Gospel of Truth, in the Valentinian fragments, and in later Valentinian sources; we cannot explain this by chance. Thy myth under this particular form is the conception of Valentinus. If we are right in our suggestion, Valentinus must be the author of the Gospel of Truth and the author of the myth of Sophia under the above described perspective of the other Valentinian sources. The presence of the myth under various other forms has nothing to do with Valentinus and Valentinianism. The myth is specifically Valentinian in so far as it conveys Valentinus' single idea that the whole of the world drama, spirit and matter, creation, operation of the world, cosmology, anthropology and soteriology, derived from one source and ultimately return to it. We have here more than the hellenistic myth of the descent and reascent of the soul. We have the descent and reascent of the whole world, material and spiritual, and not just the up and down trip of one element of the universe. Valentinus adjusted the Sophia myth to this purpose and, consequently, made it the main vehicle by which he expressed his creed.

We may ask an ultimate question: Why did Valentinus insist on a monistic interpretation of reality? This may be explained by his Oriental conception of reality in terms of one substance. Hinduism was known in Alexandria, his native land. This explanation may be combined with another one. Valentinus was a Christian, therefore, a monotheist. His explanation of evil avoids theological dualism.

As in the Manual of Discipline of the Dead Sea Scrolls, God

---

[1]Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures, English translation (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1956), pp. 43-46.

8 himself is responsible for the presence of two conflicting spirits in man; Valentine in the final analysis attributes evil to God. This goes along the line of Rabbinical Orthodoxy and can be traced to the Old Testament. It was the only way to avoid a second principle responsible for the other half of reality. The Demiurge of the Valentinian sources and even their "Devil" are episodes. They too are traced to the same ultimate source. In this, Valentinus sharply differs from Marcion, since His "Good Father" is the origin of evil too. The Valentinian Devil is not an angel who rebelled against his creator; he was evil by nature, as his father the Demiurge was.

Valentinus is not the only case where Jewish monotheism was combined to philosophical monism. Valentinus may have combined it to Hindu monism; Spinoza starting from Philo, the fellow countryman of Valentinus and almost his contemporary, resulted into his static pantheism. It was from the study of Philo that Wolfson was led to the study of Spinoza.

There is something, however, that is peculiar to the Valentinian doctrine of Sophia. Not all that owes its derivation from God will be saved. There is a law of Absolute predestination at work here. The material world will never return to its source of origin, but will be destroyed. Is this a last consequence of the doctrine of its illusionary character? The cause of its illusionary existence is the Passion of Sophia, and Sophia separated her passions from herself as waste.

A better fate is preserved for the animal nature. Upon a right use of free will, psychic beings will go up above all heavens

at the gate of the Pleroma, but will never enter it. Ultimately the divine substance suffers a loss. The Gospel of Truth admits that by asserting: "Oblivion [a name for Ignorance, the core of evil] did not exist close to the Father, although It came into existence because of Him."[1]

---

[1] EV 18. 1-3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altaner, Berthold. Patrology. 4th ed. rev. New York: Herder and Herder, 1956.

Arai, Sasagu. Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.

Aserinsky, Eugene, and Kleitman, Nathaniel. "Regularly Occuring Periods of Eye Motility, and Concomitant Phenomena During Sleep," Science, CXVIII, No. 3062 (September 4, 1953), 273-74.

Barth, Carola. "Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis," Texte und Untersuchungen, Vol. XXXVII, No. 3 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1911).

Bernard, John Henry. The Odes of Solomon. "Texts and Studies," Vol. VIII, No. 3. Cambridge: The University Press, 1912.

Bloom, Edward A., Philbrick, Charles H., and Blistein, Elmer M. The Order of Poetry: An Introduction. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1961.

Bouquet, Alan Coates. Hinduism. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1948.

Bousset, Wilhelm. Hauptprobleme der Gnosis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1907.

_____. Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christenglaubens von den Aufungen des Christentums bis Iranaus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1926.

Braun, F. M. "L'énigme des Odes de Salomon," Revue Thomiste, LVII, No. 4 (October-December, 1957), 597-625.

Brooke, A. E. The Fragments of Heracleon. "Texts and Studies," Vol. I, No. 4. Collated by Joseph Armitage. Cambridge: The University Press, 1891.

Bultman, Rudolf. Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der Antiken Religionen. Zürig: Artemis - Verlag, 1949.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Scribner's, Vol. I, 1951; Vol. II, 1955.

Casey, Robert Pierce (ed.). The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria. London: Christophers, 1934.

Clemens Alexandrinus. Protrepticus und Paedagogus. Vol. I. Edited by Otto Stählin. 3d ed. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1936.

_____. Stromata I-VI. Vol. II. 3d ed. Edited by Otto Stählin. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960.

Cross, F. L. (ed.). The Jung Codex. London, 1955.

Deussen, Paul. The System of the Vedânta. Translated by Charles Johnson. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1912.

Dibelius, Otto. "Studien zur Geschichte der Valenentinianer," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, IX (1908), 230-47; 329-40.

Dix, Gregory. "The Seal in the Second Century A.D.," Theology, LI, No. 33 (January, 1948), 7-12.

Dodd, C. H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: The University Press, 1953.

_____. The Johannine Epistles. "The Moffat New Testament Commentary." New York: Harper, 1946.

Dölger, Franz J. " ΙΧΘΥΣ : Das Fischsymbol in Frühchristlicher Zeit," I. Band. Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen. Rom: In Kommission der Herder'schen Verlagshandlung zur Freiburg i. B. und der Buchhandlung Spithöven zu Rom, 1910.

Doresse, Jean. The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics. New York: Viking Press, 1960.

Festugière, André-Marie Jean. L'Idéal Religieux des Grecs et l'Évangile. "Études Bibliques." Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1932.

_____. La Révélation d'hermes Trismégiste I: L'Astrologie et les Sciences Occultes. "Études Bibliques." Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1950.

_____. La Révélation d'Hermes Trismégiste II: Le Dieu Cosmique. "Études Bibliques." Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1949.

_____. La Révélation d'Hermes Trismégiste III: Les Doctrines de l'Âme. "Études Bibliques." Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1953.

_____. La Révélation d'Hermes Trismégiste IV: Le Dieu Inconnu et la Gnose. "Études Bibliques." Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1954.

Festugière, André-Marie Jean. "Notes sur les Extraits d'Alexandrie et sur les fragments de Valentin," Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. III (1949).

Foerster, Werner. "Von Valentin zu Herakleon," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. VII (Giessen, 1928).

Gaster, Theodor H. The Dead Sea Scriptures. English Translation. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1956.

Gebhardt, Oscar; Harnack, Adolphus, and Zahn, Theodorus (eds.). Patrum Apostolicorum Opera. 6th ed. Lipsiae: J. C. Hinrichs, 1920.

Giversen, Sören. Sandhedens Evangelium De gnostiske handskrifter fra Nildalen. Kopenhagen, 1957.

_____. Thomas Evangelium. Kopenhagen, 1955.

Grant, Robert M. The Apostolic Fathers I: An Introduction. New York: The Nelson Press, 1964.

_____. Gnosticism and Early Christianity. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

_____. "Notes on Gnosis," Vigiliae Christianae, XI (1957), 145.

_____. "Scripture Rhetoric and Theology in Theophilus," Vigiliae Christianae, XIII (1959), 33-45.

Grant, Robert M. (ed.). Gnosticism: A Source Book of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Hunt, Arthur S. The Amherst Papyri, I and II. London: Henry Growde, Oxford University Press, 1900.

Grobel, Kendrick. The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel. Translation from the Coptic and Commentary. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Gunkel, Herman. "Die Oden Salomon," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XI (1910), 291-328.

Halporn, James W., Ostwald, Martin, and Rosenmeyer, Thomas G. The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1963.

Hamilton, G. F. "Confirmation and the Eucharist in the Odes of Solomon," Irish Church Quarterly, October, 1915.

Harris, Rendel J. The Odes and Psalms of Solomon. Cambridge: The University Press, 1909.

Harris, Rendel J., and Mingana, Alphonse. The Odes and Psalms of Solomon. Vol. II. 2d ed. rev. translation. Manchester: The University Press, 1920.

Harvey, William W. Irenaeus Adversus Haereses. Cantabrigiae: Typis Academicis, 1857.

Harvey, Sir Paul. The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.

Heinrici, G. Die Valentinianische Gnosis und die Heilige Schrift. Berlin, 1871.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums. Leipzig: Reisland, 1889.

Holl, Karl. "Epiphanius: Anchoratus und Panarion," in Vols. I, II, and III of Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1915, 1922, 1931.

Hubbell, Jay B., and Beatty, John O. An Introduction to Poetry. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.

James, Montagne R. The Apocryphal New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Jonas, Hans. Gnosis und Spätantike Geist. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964.

_____. The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1958.

Kahn, Edwin, Dement, William, Fisher, Charles, and Barmack, Joseph E. "Incidence of Color in Immediately Recalled Dreams," Science, CXXXVII, No. 3535 (September 28, 1962), 1054-56.

Kennedy, K. J. An Introduction to Poetry. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1966.

Kittel, Gerhard (ed.). Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgsrt: W. Kohlhammer, 1932.

Klibansky, Raymond (ed.). Plato, Philebus, and Epinomis. Translated by A. E. Taylor. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1956.

La bourt, Jerome, and Batiffol, Pierre. Les Odes de Salomon: une oeuvre chrétienne des environs de l'an 100-120 traduction française et l'introduction historique. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1911.

Lampe, G. W. H. (ed.). A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Lampe, G. W. H. The Seal of the Spirit. London: Longmans, 1951.

Lattimore, Richmond. The Iliad of Homer. Chicago: The University Press, 1951.

Lietzmann, Hans. "Ein Beitrag zu Mandäerfrage," Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, XXVII (November 6, 1930), 595-608.

_____. The Founding of the Church Universal. A History of the Early Church. Vol. II. Translated by Bertram Lee. 2d ed. rev. London: Lutterworth Press, 1950.

_____. Geschichte der Alten Kirche. Berlin und Leipzig: W. Gruyter and Company, 1932.

Malinine, M. (ed.). De Resurrectione: Epistula ad Rheginum. Zürich und Stuttgart: Rascher Verlag, 1963.

Marcus, Ralph. "Pleroma und Fulfillment," Vigiliae Christianae, VIII (1954), 211.

Maryosip, M. The Oldest Christian Hymn Book. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Ménard, Jacques E. L'Évangile de Vérité: Rétroversion Grecque et Commentaire. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962.

_____. "Le Sitz im Leben de l'Évangile de Vérité," Studia Monte Regis, VI (1963), 57-66.

Migne, J. P. Patrologia Graeca. Vols. VIII - IX. Paris, 1857.

Mingana, Alphonse. "Woodbrooke Studies," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. XIV (January, 1930).

Moncrieff, Philip D. Paganism and Christianity in Egypt. Cambridge: The University Press, 1913.

Müller, Max F. (trans.). The Upanisads. New York: Dover Publications, 1962.

Newbold, William R. "Bardaisan and the Odes of Solomon," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. XXX (1911).

_____. "The Descent of Christ in the Odes of Solomon," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXI, Part 3 (1912), 168-209.

Nock, A. D., and Festugiére, A.-M. J. "Collection Guillaume Budé," Corpus Hermeticum. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945.

Norden, Edward. Die Antike Kunstprosa vom VI jahrhundert v. Christus

bis in die zeit der Renaissance II. 2d ed. rev. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1909.

Otto, Rudolf. Das Heilige. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936.

Pack, Roger A. Artemidorus Daldianus Onirocriticon. "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana," Livri V. Lipsiae: Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1963.

Powel, John U. (ed.). Lyrica Adespota. "Collectanea Alexandrina." Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

Preuschen, E. "Ein Übersetzungs Fehler in den Oden Salomos," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XVI (1915), 233-235.

_____. "Origenes Werke," Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, IV (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1903), 512.

Price, M. I., Irwin, W. A., and Wikgren, A. P. The Ancestry of Our English Bible. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Puech, Henri C. Le Manichaisme son Fondateur, sa Doctrine. Paris: Publications du Musée Guimet, 1949.

Puech, Henri C., Quispel, Gilles, and Malinine, M. (eds.). Evangelium Veritatis. Zürich: Rascher Verlag, 1956.

Puech, Henri C., Quispel, Gilles, and Van Unnik, William C. The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus. Translated and edited by Frank Leslie. London: Morehouse-Gorham Company, 1955.

Quispel, Gilles. "La Conception de l'Homme dans la Gnose Valentinienne," Eranos Jahrbuch, XV (Zürich: Rheinos Verlage, 1947-1948), 247-86.

_____. "The Original Doctrine of Valentine," Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. I (1947).

_____. "Ptolemée, Lettre à Flora," Sources Chrtiennes, Vol. XXIV (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1950).

Φιλιππίδου, Λεωνίδου, Ἰ. Ἡ Περί Θλίψεως καί Λυτρώσεως Θεωρία τῆς Βεδάντα. Ἀθῆναι Πυρσός, 1934.

Ringgren, Helmer. "Evangelium Veritatis och den Valentinianska Gnosis," Religion och Bibel, XVII (1958), 41-53.

Sagnard, François M. M. "Clemens, Titus, Flavius, Alexandrinus: Les Extraits de Théodote," Sources Chrétiennes, Vol. XXIII (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1948).

Sagnard, François M.-M. "La Gnose Valentienne et le Témoignage de Saint Irenée," Études de Philosophie Médiévale, Vol. XXXVI (Paris: Librairie Philosophique, J. Vrin, 1947).

Schenke, Hans Martin. Die Herkunft des sogenannten Evangelium Veritatis. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

Schmidt, Carl. Pistis Sophia. "Koptisch Gnostische Schriften," Vol. I. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1925.

Segelberg, Eric. "Evangelium Veritatis: A Confirmation Homily and Its Relation to the Odes of Solomon," Orientalia Suecana, VIII (1959), 3-42.

_____. Maṣbūtā: Studies in the Ritual of the Mandaean Baptism. Uppsala: Almquest and Wiksells, 1958.

Söderbergh, T. Säve. "Det Koptiska Evangelium Veritatis," Religion och Bibel, XVII (1958), 28-40.

_____. "Evangelium Veritatis och Thomas Evangeliet," Symbolae Biblicae Uppsalienses, Vol. XVI (Uppsala, 1959).

Sprengling, M. "Bardesanes and the Odes of Solomon," American Journal of Theology, XV (1911), 459-61.

Stölten, W. "Gnostische Parallelen zu den Oden Salomos," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. XIII (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, Verlag, 1912).

Swami, Probhávananda, and Isherwood, Christopher. The Song of God: Bhagavad-gita. English translation. Hollywood, Calif.: Vedânta Press, 1951.

Tauber, Edward S., and Green, Maurice. "Color in Dreams," American Journal of Psychotherapy, XVI (1962), 221-29.

Tertullianus, Quintus Septimus Florens. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. The Prescription against Heretics. Translated by Rev. Peter Holmes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Erdmans Publishing Company, 1951. III, 257-60.

Testuz, M. Papyrus Bodmer X-XII: XI Onziéme Ode de Salomon. Cologny-Genéve, 1959.

Τρεμπέλα, Παναγιώτου, Ν. Ὁμιλητική ἢ Θεωρία τοῦ Κηρύγματος. Ἀθῆναι: Ζωή, 1928.

Van Unnik, William Cornelis. "The Gospel of Truth and the New Testament," The Jung Codex. Edited by F. L. Cross. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1955.

Van Unnik, William Cornelis. "Het Kortgeleden ontdekte Evangelie der Waarheid en bet Niewe Testament," Mededelingen der Kominklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenshappen, Afd. Letterkunde. Amsterdam: Nieuwe Reeks, 1954.

Verbeke, G. L'Évolution de la Doctrine du Pneuma du Stoicisme à S. Augustin. Paris: Éditions de L'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie de Louvain, 1945.

Völker, Walther. Quellen zur Geschichte der Christlichen Gnosis. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1932.

_____. "Quellen zur Geschichte der Christlischen Gnosis," Sammlung Ausgewähler Kirchen - und Dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, heraus gegeben von Gustav Krüger. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1932.

Wendland, P. "Hippolytus Werke. Refutatio omnium Haeresium (Elenchos)," Die griechrischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Vol. XXVI (Leipzig, 1916).

Wheeler, Charles B. The Design of Poetry. New York: W. W. Norton, 1966.

Wilamowitz, Ulrich Von Möllendorf. Griechische Verskunst. Berlin: Weidmann, 1921.

_____. "Hermes," Lesefrüchte, XXIV (1899), 203-30; 601-39.

_____. Timotheos Die Perser. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1903.

Wilson, Robert McLachlan. The Gnostic Problem. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1958.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam, I and II. "Structure and Growth of Philosophic Systems from Plato to Spinoza," Vol. II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

_____. The Philosophy of the Church Fathers. Vol. I: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation. "Structure and Growth of Philosophic Systems from Plato to Spinoza," Vol. III. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Zahn, Theodore. "Die Oden Salomos," Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, XXI (1910), 667-701; 747-777.

Zwaan, J. De. "The Edessene Origin of the Odes of Solomon," Quantulacumque, Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake. Edited by Robert P. Case, Silva and Agnes K. Lake. London: Christophers, 1937.

_____. "Ignatius and the Odist," American Journal of Theology, Vol. XV (1911).